

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXII.

BALTIMORE, MAY, 1907.

No. 5.

ALL OF THE FIVE FICTITIOUS ITALIAN EDITIONS OF WRITINGS OF MACHIAVELLI AND THREE OF THOSE OF PIETRO ARETINO PRINTED BY JOHN WOLFE OF LONDON (1584-1589). II.

Recapitulation and Completion of the Arguments.

In the first part of this paper which appeared in *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. xxii (1907), pp. 2-6,* the *Historie* and the *Asino d'Oro* of Machiavelli (1587 and 1588) and the *Quattro Comedie* and the *Terza, et Ultima Parte de Ragionamenti* of Pietro Aretino (1588 and 1589) were assigned to John Wolfe on the strength of documentary evidence from the contemporary Stationers' Registers. The *Discorsi* and the *Prencipe* and the *Arte della Guerra* of Machiavelli (1584 and 1587), all with the device of a flourishing palm-tree with serpents and toads about the root and the motto: *Il vostro malignare non gioua nulla*, were attributed to him, apart from other typographical reasons, on account of his appearing as the possessor of this device in 1593, six years before Adam Islip used it, to which may now be added that this palm-tree is found three more times in books printed by Wolfe in 1592 and 1593, and as early as 1594 in one printed by Islip,¹ and that according to documentary evi-

dence the latter bought his type and printing implements from the former and therefore obtained the device in question in a perfectly legal way.² The First and Second Part of the *Ragionamenti* of Pietro Aretino with appendix (1584) finally were ascribed to John Wolfe because of their complete agreement in type, initial letters and ornaments with other books printed by him. But as this evidence, however strong it may be, does not seem quite equal to that of the preceding cases, it is a matter of satisfaction that the other two editions of the *Ragionamenti I & II*, mentioned there as well as a fourth of the same year

1592, and *Pierces Supererogation or a new prayse of the Old Asse. A Preparatiue to certaine larger Discourses, intituled Nashes S. Fame*, 1593. In the latter the title-page with the device occurs twice, once at the beginning and then again on the eleventh leaf. In Ames-Herbert, *Typographical Antiquities*, II, 1181, only the first ten leaves are mentioned and recorded as a book by itself. Islip first used it in William Clerke, *Triall of Bastardie*, 1594, and often afterwards without special reference to the contents of the books.

² The documentary statement is found with Arber, *Transcript*, III, 700, saying that 'Adam Islip bought his printing house Letter [type] and Implements of John Wolfe and succeeded him, being an ancient Erection' and is taken by Arber himself (v, 204) as meaning that 'He succeeded J. Wolfe, this year,' i. e., the year of his death, 1601, 'as a Master Printer and in his Printing House.' This interpretation can only be correct as far as the succession as a Master Printer is concerned, for the transfer of the device of the palm-tree in 1594 is not the only evidence that the purchase of type and implements must have occurred much earlier. In the first place, Wolfe's widow did not dispose of her husband's belongings, but continued his business. She did not only give the old apprentices a chance to serve out their time (*l. c.*, II, 728, 730 and 734) but she also engaged a new one in the person of John Adams, a son of Frauncis Adams, a devoted friend of her husband, who had died about the same time (*l. c.*, II, 253), and made two extensive transfers of books—none of our Italian prints among them however,—to her former apprentice, John Pindley, as late as 1612 (*l. c.*, III, 483 and 487). In the second place, Islip did not wait to start in business till 1601, but established himself in 1594 when he engaged his first apprentice, to whom he added another at the beginning of 1596 (*l. c.*, II, 192 and 208). There is even a record of a license granted to him Sept. 16, 1591,

* The following corrections should be made in this part. First: The figures in the Roman numerals, p. 3, A 5 and B 1-3, should all be of the same size. Second: In the title read 1589 for 1588; p. 3, B 2, *Carte viii* + 288 for Pp. xvi + 292; p. 5, col. 2, l. 5, *si parla* for *riparla* and *ibid.*, l. 14, the for *The*. Third: Supply *Carte 0* + 115 at the close of A 5, an apostrophe B 1 after *e* in *el*, dividing lines after A 1, xxvij di, A 2 *Prencipe*, *chiauelli* and *nella*, A 3 *ueli*, A 4 *ammendate*, A 5 *seguente*, B 1 *Ficata* and *Si* and B 3 *cosa*, and hyphens after A 3 *appres*, B 1 *divui* and *Si* and B 2 *conosci*.

¹ Wolfe used the device of the palm-tree, which so excellently fits the *Discorsi* and the *Prencipe* of Machiavelli that it must have been specially designed for them, quite appropriately in two controversial books by Gabriell Harvey, viz., *Foure Letters and certaine Sonnets: Especially touching Robert Greene, and other parties, by him abused, etc.*,

which I have found since I have been in Berlin, have all turned out to be reprints of Wolfe's.³ The Prefaces by Barbagrigia and his Heir are, therefore, original with our edition and John Wolfe's case receives additional strength both from the similarity with which the fictions of Barbagrigia and Antoniello degli Antonielli are carried out, and from the fact that the edition of Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, which Barbagrigia promises to issue at some future date, was actually planned by John Wolfe in 1587, not to speak of the other works of Pietro Aretino promised by Barbagrigia and mostly either printed or intended to be printed by John Wolfe. Indeed, in the Preface to the *Ragionamenti* III of 1589 the veil is so far lifted that we learn that only a few copies of Parts I and II of 1584 may still be had. After John Wolfe's title to all of the eight editions has thus been still more firmly established, we are now ready to turn to his life and the

but this was not given unconditionally, and at all events there is no evidence of his having actually printed anything in his own name before 1594. In the third place, there is direct documentary evidence to the effect that in 1595 William Moorin[g] and Adam Islip, partners, succeeded John Wolfe in trade and place (*l. c.*, III, 702), and we find this not only confirmed by the fact that Wolfe changed his place of business from Paul's Chain, where it is found from 1592-1594 (*l. c.*, V, 166, 170 and 174), to Pope's Head Alley, Lombard street, where it is from 1596 on (*l. c.*, V, 182, etc.), no place being recorded for 1595, but also by Wolfe's sharing his license for Books II, III, IV and V of *Amadis de Gaule* with Adam Islip and William Morynge, Oct. 16, 1594 (*l. c.*, II, 662, together with II, 607 and III, 483), which is at the same time the only occurrence of the name of Moring in all the licenses, so that his partnership with Islip cannot have lasted long. Other books licensed to Wolfe but printed by Islip about the same time are: Antonio de Gueuara, *The Mount of Calvarie*, licensed to the former in 1593 (*l. c.*, II, 638) and printed by the latter with the device of the palm-tree (!) in 1595; and likewise probably Huarte: *Examen de Ingenios. The Examination of men's wits*, etc., licensed to Wolfe in 1590 (*l. c.*, II, 557) and printed by Islip in 1594, to which we shall have occasion to return below. At all events, there are plenty of indications that the transfer of the device of the palm-tree from Wolfe to Islip was perfectly legal and the possibility of Islip's having used it in connection with the *Discorsi* and the *Prencipe* in 1584 is excluded by the fact that he did not finish his apprenticeship till June of the following year (*l. c.*, II, 694).

³ I reserve the detailed proof of the priority of Wolfe's edition which I had intended to insert here for some other occasion, and will simply say that Wolfe's edition repeat-

prominent part he played in the stormy period through which the English book trade passed in the eighties of the sixteenth century, a matter which is of so much general interest that it seems desirable to go a little more into detail than the question in hand in itself demands. My account is based on the documents and records published in Arber's *Transcript*, to which all references in the text are made and on the following two *Rappresentazioni* to which my attention was courteously called by Arundell Esdaile of the British Museum who saw a notice of one of them in a recent catalogue of Jacques Rosenthal of Munich. *Historia et Vita di Santo Bernardino*. | Woodcut representing the Ascension of the Saint | Dddd. At the close: *In Fiorenza, Ad instanzia di Giouanni | Vuolfo Inglese*, 1576. 2 leaves. 4°.

La Historia e Orazione di Santo Stefano Protomartire. | *Quale fu eletto Diacono dalli Apostoli, e come fu lapidato da Giudei*. | *Nuouamente Ristampata*. | Woodcut representing the Saint in a landscape. | Hhhh. At the close: *In Fiorenza, Ad instanzia di Giouanni | Vuolfo Inglese*, 1576. 2 leaves. 4°.

Since in later years John Wolfe so often puts the name of an Italian city on books printed by him in London, it may be added that the genuine Italian origin of these two leaflets is placed beyond doubt both by their close resemblance to some of the many other *Rappresentazioni* printed at Flor-

edly agrees with the edition of the First Part of the *Ragionamenti* which bears the false date of Paris, and the print of the Third Day of the First Part entitled *Opera noua del diuino & vnico signor Pietro Aretino: laqual scuopre le astutie: scelerita, frode, tradimenti . . . che vsano le Cortigiane*, etc., etc., purporting to have appeared in Naples, 1534, where one or more of the other three editions differ. As the *Ragionamenti* I and II, in spite of the avowed moral purposes of the author, are utterly repulsive by their obscenity, it is more complimentary to Wolfe's not over-scrupulous business instincts than to the taste of the reading public that not only his edition but also three or even four reprints of it should have found a market, for it is not impossible that the only edition of 1584 mentioned by Carlo Bertani, *Pietro Aretino e le Sue Opere*, p. 362f., is different from the other four, because it alone adds the Dialogue between Ginevra and Rosana. The *Ragionamenti* III of 1589, on the other hand, are absolutely unobjectionable, and also the *Comedie* are staunchly defended by Bertani, *l. c.*, 377, whose appreciation of Pietro Aretino for the rest may be gauged by the fact that he inscribes his study to his wife.

ence at that time and by the fact that his name is found here alongside of that of an Italian city which in the other cases of course never occurs.

John Wolfe's Life and His Part in the Troubles of the Stationers' Company.

John Wolfe served his apprenticeship under John Day, one of the most influential and prosperous London printers and stationers of the first part of Queen Elizabeth's reign and a personal favorite of Lord Leicester from 1562-1572 (I, 172). At the close of it he failed however to obtain his admission as a freeman to the Stationers' Company, and had to be satisfied with the freedom of the Fishmongers who do not seem to have objected to his 'many loose pointes of behaviour' as strongly as the Stationers. Probably soon afterward he went abroad, 'gadding from countrey to countrey,' as the Queen's Printer Christopher Barker disparagingly calls it (II, 780), but as a matter of fact laying the foundations for his future success in life and his publication of Italian books in England. Not only this but also his surname Machivill, which then was almost synonymous with Italian in an odious sense, tend to indicate that his stay in Italy was a prolonged one, and perhaps it is not amiss to suppose that he was connected for a while with the famous printing establishment of the Giunti, who sometimes employed foreigners. At least he adopted their device of the heraldic lilies for his own and the Dddd and Hhhh on the titles of his *Rappresentazioni* find a parallel in the Iiii on the title of a *Scelta di Laudi Spirituali* printed 'Nella Stamperia de' Giunti' in 1578.

In or before 1579, the year of his first license, he was back in England where it was then almost an impossibility for a man without means or patronage to make a living in the printers' and stationers' trade. Whole classes of the most profitable lawful and serious books had by royal patents, often injudiciously granted, come into the hands of a few; efforts were making to subject the production of light literature, hitherto free to all, with the exception of books printed in a foreign language, to a more rigorous supervision (II, 752), and in addition to this the number of printers exceeded in the opinion of some by more

than twice the actual demand.⁴ Wolfe, however, then already past thirty, was determined not to go to the wall and decided to make a place for himself in the profession by force or favor, right or wrong. He began with an attempt to become one of the privileged few, but when the patent for which he had applied was refused because it 'was thought vnreasonable by some serving her Maiestie' (I, 144), he resolutely joined the most desperate among the discontented who had organized or just were organizing for the wholesale production and dispersion of the most popular school books owned by the patentees (II, 19). Rising to the leadership of these men by his superior energy and perhaps also by his 'Macheuillian deuices, and conceit of forreine wit,' with which Christopher Barker credits him on May 14, 1582, *i. e.*, over a year before he printed his first edition of Machiavelli, he made such an onslaught upon the existing order of things in the Stationers' Company that not only the patentees lost their profits and were disobeyed by their journeymen and apprentices, which latter even 'married wiues and for a time did what they list' (II, 782), but that a revolutionary spirit began to pervade the populace of the city.

'WOLFE and his confederats,' a Supplication to the Privy Council, probably dated March, 1583, says (II, 781 f.), 'affirmed openly in ye Stationers hall, yat it was lawfull for all men to print all lawfull booke what commandement soeuer her Maiestie gaue to ye contrary.' 'WOLFE being admonished, yat he being but one so meane a man should not presume to contrarie her Highnesse gouernmente: "Tush," said he, "LUTHER was but one man, and reformed all ye world for religion, and I am that one man, yat must and will reforme the gouernement in this trade," meaning printing and booke-selling.' 'WOLFE and his confederats made collections of money of diuers her maiesties poore subiects, perswading them to ouerthrow all

⁴ In Dec., 1582, Christopher Barker reports: 'There are 22 printing howses in London where '8 or 10' at the most would suffice for all England, yea and Scotland too (I, 172). In May of the next year there were 23 printers with 53 presses (I, 248). At that time 'John Wolf hath iii presses, and ii more since found in a secret Vau[l]t' *i. e.*, as many as the Queen's Printer and more than anybody else.'

priuiledges, and being demanded why he did so, answered his purse was not able to maintaine so great a Cause as yat he had in hand.' 'WOLFE and his confederats incensed ye meaner sort of people throughout the City as they went, yat it became a common talke in Alehouses, tauernes and such like places, whereupon insued dangerous and vndutifull speaches of her Maiesties most gracious gouernment.'

In vain Christopher Barker had furnished him with work at his own loss and offered him 'for quietness sake' even more than reasonable furtherance in his plans, for during their very negotiations 'although WOLFE denied to haue any more of Barkars Copies in Printing his seruants were in work of ye same, as within 4 hours after was manifest' (II, 780). Thrown into prison he continued to foment trouble by means of those who came to see him, and even to the efforts of the special Commission appointed by the Queen to restore peace and order he and his associates for a good while turned a deaf ear until, not long after another search and extensive confiscations made at his house (I, 499), he suddenly 'acknowledged his error' (II, 784) and withdrew from the contest—being admitted a freeman to the Company, July 1, 1583 (II, 688)—not so much induced, it seems, by the concessions which under the pressure of the situation and the government, the patentees were about to make to all of the poorer members in common,⁵ as by a prospect of special personal advantages at which he had been aiming from the first and which he was probably keen enough to see might escape him if he persisted longer in his rebellious attitude. In the autumn of the following year in fact, he and his fellow-agitator, Frauncis Adams, were given a share in the valuable patent of John Day, deceased, and his son Richard.

Now we do not only find both him and Adams entering a complaint to the Queen against those who were unlawfully exploiting their new patent and serving them as they themselves had served others (II, 790 ff.), but after the passage of the new Star Chamber Decree for orders in printing

⁵January 8, 1584, the leading patentees relinquished their exclusive rights to a great number of books (II, 786 ff.).

of June 23, 1586 (II, 807 ff.), which, partly by its fairness and partly by its severity, put a stop to almost all disorders, he sought and obtained the appointment as a Beadle of the Company.

In the discharge of the duties of this office he 'ryd to Croydon for a warraunt of Roger Warde,' one of his most daring former colleagues in surreptitious printing (I, 527), and proved a relentless executor of one of the most draconic paragraphs of the Decree just mentioned against Robert Waldegraue. 'You know that Walde-graues printing presse and Letters were taken away : his presse being timber / was sawen and hewed in pieces / the yron work was battered and made vnserviceable / his Letters melted / with cases and other tooles defaced (by John Woolfe / alias Machiuill (!) / Beadle of the Stationers / and most tormenting executioner of Walde-graues goods), etc.'⁶ In 1591 Wolfe had his salary as a beadle almost doubled from £6 to £10 = \$300 to \$500, according to the present value of money⁷; in 1593 he succeeded Hugh Singleton as a Printer to the City of London,⁸ and in 1598 finally, three years before his death, he was 'admitted into the Liuerye' of his Company (II, 872).

As a publisher he certainly played 'the Bees part,' as Gabriell Harvey puts it in the letter mentioned in note 8, for during the six years from 1588-1593 from 25 per cent. to 33 per cent. of all books and pamphlets licensed to London pub-

⁶Martin Marprelate, The Epistle [September-November, 1588] in Arber, *The English Scholar's Library of Old and Modern Works*, No. 11, p. 22. Sad to say, John Penry, who was credited with a main share in the writings appearing under the pseudonym of Martin Marprelate, fared no better at the hands of the Anglican bishops than Giordano Bruno, of whom we have to speak later, did in Rome and was hanged in 1593 (*ibid.*, p. vii ff.).

⁷Ames-Herbert, *Typographical Antiquities*, II, 1170.

⁸The year when Wolfe became Printer to the City is given as 1594 I, xlili, as 1593 v, lx and as 1595 v, 181. The true date of his appointment is some time between April 17, 1593, the date of an 'Order to the Lord Mayor, etc., of London, for the avoidance [expulsion] of beggars, etc.', printed by or for Hugh Singleton (v, 171) and Sept. 16 of the same year, the date of a letter by Gabriell Haruey 'To my louing friend, John Wolfe, Printer to the Cittie.' According to Arber (v, 173), the title of this letter was: 'A new letter with notable contents. With a Sonnet.' The copy which I used in the British Museum lacked the title-page.

lishers belong to him. Although, probably owing to his duties as a printer to the city, his share does not reach this figure again afterwards, we may surmise that his death during the first months of 1601, probably before he had reached 55 years of age, was in no small measure due to the indefatigable zeal and energy he had displayed in all his doings. The last three books entered to him are : *Disee Mori. Learne to Dye* (Aug. 21, 1600), *The Sanctuary of A troubled soule* (Nov. 13, 1600), and *Godly meditations vpon the most holie Sacrement of the Lordes supper, &c.* (Jan. 13, 1600). His widow did not depend for her support upon others, but continued his business⁹ and thereby proved herself a worthy partner of his.

The Italian Books published by John Wolfe.

The Italian books, to which on account of their bearing upon the subject in hand some volumes of Latin poetry composed by Italians will here be added, form the most curious part of Wolfe's many-sided printing and publishing activity. For together with the works of Giordano Bruno, printed in London in 1584 and 1585, as is generally believed by Thomas Vautrollier, and the later books of Petruccio Ubaldino, printed all or all but the last by Richard Field,¹⁰ a contemporary and fellow townsman of William Shakespeare, from 1592 to 1599, they are, as far as I am aware, the only books in the Italian language published in England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, who was quite an Italian scholar herself, and for a long time afterwards.

Wolfe's first Italian book is at the same time the first book which was licensed to him as a pub-

⁹ For particulars, see note 2. She did not get any new licenses in her own name, however.

¹⁰ Richard Field succeeded Vautrollier by either marrying his daughter (Ames-Herbert, *l. c.*, 1065 and 1252, and Arber, v, lxiii) or his widow (Arber III, 702). His claim to Ubaldino's *Parte Prima delle breui Dimostrat.*, etc., 1592, rests on the license he obtained for it, Dec. 6, 1591. I am aware of the fact that the British Museum Catalogue suggests that some of the following books may be printed away from London in Antwerp?, Venice? and Oxford?, but a close typographical comparison shows that all were products of the same press, doubts being admissible only regarding the last, the second edition of the *Vita di Carlo Magno*. The absence of licenses is accounted for by Ubaldino's connection with the Court during the last years of his life.

lisher and a printer (Jan. 17, 1581)—that of 1579 had been licensed to him as a publisher only on condition that it be printed by John Charlwood (II, 353)—and the first genuine Italian book ever printed in London, because the story of *Arnalt and Lucenda*¹¹ which had appeared there six years before had been a school book and accompanied by a collateral English translation. Its title is : *La | Vita di | Carlo Magno | Imperadore, | Scritta in Lingua Italiana da Petruccio | Ubaldino Cittadin | Fiorentino.* | Flower-de-luce, apparently taken from Giunti¹² and hereafter Wolfe's most frequent device here with 'Ubique florescit.' | *Londra, | Appresso Giouanni Wolfio Inghilrese,* | 1581. | The Florentine author bids the English to whom the book is dedicated rejoice because 'l'opere Italiane non men si possono stampar felicemente in Londra, che le si stampino altroue (essendo questa la prima) per studio, & diligenza di Giouanni Wolfio suo cittadino; per la commodità del quale altre opere potrete hauer nella medesima lingua di giorno in giorno, se la stima che farete di questa sarà tale, quale si duee aspettar da huomini desiderosi di lunga, & honorata fama, come io ho sempre stimato, che siate voi fra tutti gli altri delle piu lodate nationi de i Christiani.' John Wolfe, therefore, is introduced by a competent judge as a competent printer of Italian books and prepared to meet any further demands that may arise in that line, and it would be interesting to know whether the 'altre opere' refer to other prospective literary efforts by Petruccio Ubaldino himself, or to the works of Machiavelli and Pietro Aretino, which were the next Italian books of John Wolfe's to appear.

The following list includes only those Italian books, together with a few Latin books written by Italians, which were actually printed by John Wolfe, while one which just may have been

¹¹ The Pretie | and Wittie Historie of | Arnalt and Lucenda : | With certen Rules and | Dialogues set foorth for | the learner of th' Italian tong: | And dedicated vnto the Wor- | shipfull, Sir Hierom Bowes | Knight. | By Claudius Hollyband Schole- | master, teaching in Paules | Churcheyarde by the | Signe of the | Lucrece. | Dum spiro, spero. | Imprinted at London | by Thomas Purfoote. | 1575.

¹² Compare *e. g.*, Giunti's Second Edition of the Decamerone, 1582, colophon, and my remarks above.

printed by him and others for which licenses are recorded in the Stationers' Registers, but which in reality were either not printed in Italian, or neither in Italian nor by him, or not at all will be given later. The title of *c* is quoted from the *Early English Printed Books in the University Library of Cambridge*, Vol. I, 401, and that of No. 10, which does not properly belong to the Italian books, from Ames-Herbert's *Typographical Antiquities*, II, 1175. The remainder are taken from the works themselves, but so that those given in full before are here only repeated in an abbreviated form. Where a license is recorded its date is given in parentheses.

A. Licensed :

1. *Petruccio Ubaldino, Vita di Carlo Magno*, flower-de-luce, etc., *Londra*, G. W., 1581. 4°. (Jan. 17, 1581.)

B. Not licensed :

2. *Machiavelli, Discorsi*, palm-tree, *Palermo*, Jan. 28, 1584. 8°.
3. *Machiavelli, Principe*, palm-tree, *Palermo*, Jan. 28, 1584. 8°.
4. *Pietro Aretino, Ragionamenti I & II* with *Commento di Ser Agresto*, etc., no device, s. l., 1584. 8°. (Preface from Bengodi, Oct. 21, 1584.)
- a. *Torquati Tassi | Solymeidos, | Liber Primus Latini | nis numeris ex- | pressus. A Scipio Gentili. | Flower-de-luce | Londini. | Execu- | debat Johannes Wolfius* | 1584. 4°.
- b. *Scipii Gentilis | Solymeidos | Libri duo priores | de | Torquati Tassi | Italicis expressi: | Flow- | er-de-luce | Londini. | Apud Johannem Wol- | fium* | 1584. 4°.
- c. *Torquato Tasso. Plutonis Concilium. Ex initio quarti libri Solymeidos. Londini. Apud Johannem Wolfium*. 1584. 4°.
- d. *Scipii Gentilis | in xxv. | Dauidis Psalmos | Epicae | Paraphrases. | Flower-de-luce. | Lon- | dini | Apud Johannem Wolfium*. | 1584. 4°.
4. *La Vita di Giulio | Agricola scritta since- | risimamente | da | Cornelio Tacito suo Genero. | Et Messa in volgare da Giovan. Maria Man- | nelli. | Arms of the Lord Robert Sidney to whom the book is dedicated. | Londra | Nella Stamperia di Giovanni Wolfio* | 1585. 4°.

- e. *Julii Caesaris | Stellae | Nob. Rom. | Colum- | beidos, | Libri Piores | duo. | Flower-de- | luce. | Londini | Apud Johannem Wolfium. | 1585. 4°. (Edited by Jacobus Castelvetrius.)*
- e*. The same book without the leaf containing the dedication to Sir Walter Raleigh and with the substitution of *Lugduni* for *Londini* | *Apud Johannem Wolfium*.
6. *Machiavelli, Libro dell' Arte della Guerra*, palm-tree, *Palermo*, s. a. 8°.
- 6*. The same book with the title : *I sette Libri dell' Arte della Guerra* and the substitution of 1587 for the palm-tree and *Palermo*.

Aa. Licensed :

7. *Essamine di | varii Giudicii | de i Politici : e | della Dot- | trina e de i fatti de i Pro- | testanti | veri, & de i Cattolici Romani. | Libri quattro. | Per Gio. Battista Aurellio. | Con la tauola, | etc. | Flower-de-luce with 'Ubique floret' in | elaborate setting | In Londra | Appresso Gio- | uanni Wolfio* | 1587. 4°. (May 4, 1587.)
8. *Macchiavelli, Historie*, Giglio's device, In *Piacenza*, 1587. 12°. (Sept. 18, 1587.)
9. *Deseritione | del Regno di Scotia, | et | delle | Isole sue ad- | iacenti di Petruccio Vbaldini | Cittadin Fiorentino. | Nella quale, etc. Flow- | er-de-luce as in No. 7. | Anversa. | Il Di- | primo di Gennaio. | M. D. LXXXVIII. Fol. | (Nov. 27, 1587.)*
10. *The Courtier of Count Bald[a]ssar[e] Cas- | ti[g]lio, deuided into foure Bookes. In three | columns, English, French, Italian. Printed | for the Cumpany, etc. 1588. 4°. (Dec. 4, | 1587.)*
11. *Macchiavelli, L' Asino d' Oro*, part of Giglio's device, In *Roma*, 1588. 8°. (Sept. 17, 1588.)
12. *Pietro Aretino, Quattro Comedie*, head of *Aretino*, s. l., 1588. 8°. (Sept. 20, 1588.)
13. *Pietro Aretino, Ragionamenti III*, head of *Aretino*, s. l., 1589. 8°. (Preface from *Val- | cerca*.) (Oct. 14, 1588.)
14. *Lettera di | Francesco | Betti gentilhuomo | Romano. | All'—S. Mar- | chese di Pescara. | Nella qual da conto a S. Ecc. della cagione | che | l'ha mosso a partirsi del suo serui- | gio, | & vscir d'Italia. | Stampata la seconda volta, | etc. | Flower-de-luce | Londra | Appresso Gio- | uanni Wolfio* | 1589 | 8°. (Dec. 4, 1588.)

15. *Le Vite del- | le Donne | Illustri. | Del Regno d'In- | ghilterra, & del Regno di Scotia & di | quelli, che d'altri paesi ne i due detti | Regni sono stato maritate. | Doue, etc. | Scritte in lingua Italiana da Petruccio Ubaldino | Cittadin Fiorentino. | Flower-de-luce | Londra | Appresso Giouanni Volfo. | 1591. | 4°. (July 23, 1590.)*

Bb. Not licensed :

16. *Il Pastor Fido | Tragicomedia | Pastorale | di Battista Guarini. | Al Sereniss. D. Carlo Emanuele | Duca di Sauoia &c. Dedicata. | Nelle Reali Nozze di S. A. con la Sereniss. Infante | D. Caterina d'Austria. | Flower-de-luce | Londra | Giouanni Volfeo, a spese di | Giacopo Casteluetri. MDXCI. | 12°. On page 217 follows : Aminta | Fauola | Boschereccia | del S. Torquato | Tasso | etc.*

(To be continued.)

A. GERBER.

Flensburg, Germany.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF TWO SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PLAYS.

I.

The Christmas Ordinary, a Private Show ; Wherein is expressed the Jovial Freedom of that Festival. As it was Acted at a Gentleman's House among other Revels. By W. R. Master of Arts. London. Printed for James Courtney, at the Golden Horse-shoo, on Saffron Hill, 1682.

The author, in his preface, has the following to say of his work :

“ . . . ‘Tis the First-Born of a young Academick Head, which since hath been Deliver'd of most excellent Productions. It hath lain Dormant almost half an Age, and hath only crawl'd out in Manuscript into some few hands ; who likeing the Entertainment they found in it, thought it too good a Morsel to be Devour'd by Moths, but suppos'd it a fitter Bit to feed some Bookseller, and therefore wisht it might rather be advanc'd to the Clutches of the one, than miserably be condemn'd to the grinders of the other.

“ Here are as Ingenious Passages, and as Humorous Conceits, and as Lively Descriptions,

as any occurs in the most celebrated Dramatick. But if these Beautiful Charms will not in the least allure the Reader, then let the Deformity of the Shape invite and draw him ; for ‘tis neither exact Comedy, Farce, or Tragedy, but a spatch'd Chimaera ; that hath somewhat of every one, and the Spirit, Flame, Elixir of them all. ‘Tis a Monster in Learning, as great as any that occurs in Nature, and if men will not read it for its Ingenuity, yet I hope they will come see it, as a Prodigy, and so gratifie their Curiosity, if not please their Fancy.

Helmdon, Octob.

18. 1682.

W. R.”

From the title and preface we get the following clews to the author and date of production : (1) His initials were W. R. ; (2) he was Master of Arts ; (3) he dated his preface from Helmdon in 1682 ; (4) the play was “the First-Born of a young Academick Head” ; and (5) it had been acted “almost half an Age” since. The author was doubtless William Richards, (1643–1705), son of Ralph Richards, rector at Helmdon, Northamptonshire. He entered Trinity College, Oxford, in 1658, proceeded B. A. in 1663, and M. A. in 1666 ; was appointed fellow, took holy orders, and preached at Marston, Oxfordshire. He settled at Helmdon as rector in 1675, and was living there in 1682.¹ The “most excellent Productions” referred to in the preface were : *The English Orator, or Rhetorical Descant by Way of Declamation upon some notable themes, both Historical and Philosophical, 1680* ; and *Wallography, or the Britton Described, 1682*. The latter was published under his initials only, with a preface signed “W. R., Helmdon, Oct. 24, 1681.”

That the play was produced at Oxford is proved by the following pleasantry :²

I have been lately reputed a most renowned Cheater, and indeed I borrow'd that Art of a certain City-Major, who was properly married to his Trade ; for his Wives Petty-coat was his best Warehouse ; whence he grew to be the Frontispiece of the Town ; for the Ford he maintain'd in his Cellar, and the Ox in his Head.

On the books of the Stationers' Company, June 29, 1660, was entered *The Christmas Ordinary*, comedy, by Trinity College, Oxford. The piece

¹ *Dictionary of National Biography.*

² Page 2.

was not published.³ The entry probably refers to the play by William Richards, written while he was a student at Trinity College. If so, the date is fixed at Christmas, 1659.⁴

In spite of what the author says, the play is very stupid. The plot is thus outlined in *The Argument*:

"Roger escaping from his Master *Shab-Quack*, at Christmass Time, meets with *Drink-Fight*, and joyns with him in a Knot of Merriment: They also inveigle the Hermit and *Astrophil*. Mr. *Make-peace* being pensive at his Son's Departure, sends *Humphry* to enquire him out, who, in the Disguise of a Traveller, finds them frolicking at an Ordinary; who insinuates himself into their Mirth: Afterwards, with false Dice, cheats them, and escapes. They afterwards, wrangling about the Reckoning, beat their Host, who summons them all before the Justice, and runs to *Shab-Quack* for Cure. Mr. *Make-peace* perceiving his Son *Astrophil* amongst them, joyfully entertains him and the rest. *Shab-Quack* pardons his Servant's Christmass Merriment, and the Hermit, in a jolly Humor, is bound Apprentice to the Host."

The prose is filled with ingenious scholastic conceits. A number of songs and poems give variety. A masque of "the Four parts of the Year contending for Priority" is introduced in the middle of the play: the speakers are Apollo, Terra, Ver, *Aestas*, Autumnus, and Hyems.

One passage seems to show a recollection of Shakespeare:

Austin. . . . Pray, where wert thou Bred?

Humphry. Faith, every where, I am a living Miscellany of all Customs, and I have lost my self into another *Metemp[s]ychosis*. In *Barbary* I lost my Manners, in *Hungary* mine Abstinence; my Gentility in *Sclavonia*; in *Spain* I made Shipwreck of mine Honesty; in *Germany* of my Religion.

In *The Merchant of Venice* Portia exclaims:

³ See *Biog. Dram.*, and Hazlitt's *Manual of Old English Plays*.

⁴ At this time Richards was sixteen years old. Cf. with the Prologue:

Since all then would seem candid, let none use Satyrick Rods to such a Cradle Muse.

Again:

But if our Infant-Cook shall please your nice Judgment with Messes

In the preface he refers to his work as "the First-Born of a young Academick Head."

How oddly he is suited! I think he bought his doublet in Italy, his round hose in France, his bonnet in Germany, and his behaviour everywhere.⁵

The author seems also to show a recollection of a passage, the "military postures" of the pipe, in *Wine, Beere, Ale, and Tobacco Contending for Superiority. A Dialogue. The Second Edition, much enlarged. London, 1630.*⁶

Enter *Drink-fight*, *Roger*, *Astrophil*, *Austin*: *All with Pipes on their Shoulders, and other Furniture.*

Drink-fight. Now my Martial Volunteers, to instruct you in the military Postures of the Pipe, and to make you proficient Souldiers in the Artillery of Tobacco, Lieutenant, Serjeant, &c. March up in Ranks—Stand—Stoop your Muskets—Draw your Bandileers—Charge your Pieces—Ram your Powder—Prime your Pan—Light your Match—Present—Give Fire—

Christmas Ordinary, Scene vii.

Compare the following from *Wine, Beere, Ale, and Tobacco*:

Ale. Yes, yes, I remember I have heard him reported a souldier; and once being in company with a knap-jack man, a companion of his, I obtained a copy of his military postures, which put down the pike and pot-gun cleane: pray observe 'em.

1. Take your seale.
2. Draw your box.
3. Uncase your pipe.
4. Produce your rammer.
5. Blow your pipe.
6. Open your box.
7. Fill your pipe.
8. Ramme your pipe.
9. Withdraw your rammer.
10. Return your rammer.
11. Make ready.

⁵ Such conceits, however, were very popular with the early dramatists. Cf. *Lingua*, III, 5, and *Seven Degrly Sins* (ed. Arber, p. 37).

⁶ The title of the first edition is as follows: *Wine, Beere and Ale together by the Eares. A Dialogue, written first in Dutch by Gallobelgicus, and translated out of the Originall Copie by Mercurius Britannicus. London, 1629.* This edition is inaccessible to me. The passage describing the military postures of the pipe probably appeared only in the "enlarged" edition. This "dialogue" belongs to that interesting class of university "shewes," of which *Band, Cuffe and Ruff*, and *Worke for Cutlers* are representatives.

12. Present.
13. Elbow your pipe.
14. Mouth your pipe.
15. Give fire.
16. Nose your Tobacco.
17. Puffe up your smoake.
18. Spit on your right hand.
19. Throw off your loose ashes.
20. Present to your friend.
21. As you were.
22. Clense your pipe.
23. Blow your pipe.
24. Supply your pipe.

II.

The Launching of the Mary; or The Seaman's Honest Wife, is a manuscript play preserved in the British Museum.⁷ It is contained in ms. Egerton 1994, a collection of fourteen manuscripts bound together and labelled *English Plays of the XVII Century*. *The Launching of the Mary* is number fourteen, occupying ff. 317–349, inclusive. It is written in a large fair hand. Apparently it is the first draught, written at different times, with different inks, and on different paper. Moreover, the manuscript is full of the author's corrections. Folio 317 has simply the words "Anno 1632"; f. 318, recto, contains the title and the *dramatis personæ*; verso, the prologue; ff. 319–349, the body of the play; f. 349, verso, besides the concluding (nine) lines of the play, has the epilogue, and the permission to act the play.

This play, called ye Seamen's Honest wife, all ye oathes left out in ye action as they are crosst in ye book and all other Reformations strictly observ'd, may bee acted, not otherwyse. This 27 June, 1633.

HENRY HERBERT.

I command your Bookeeper to present me with a faire Copy hereafter and to leave out all oathes, prophaness and publick Ribaldry, as he will answer it at his peril.

HERBERT.

Clews to the authorship of the play are found in the title, *The Lanchinge of the Mary written by W. M. gent in his returne from East India. Ad. 1632*, (the Prologue states further, "This was done at sea"); and in the fact that the play is

⁷ A short selection from this play was printed by Bullen, *Old English Plays*, II, 432.

little more or less than a eulogy of the East India Company.

The author was probably William Methold (d. 1653). He entered the service of the East India Company in 1615, and was rapidly promoted. That he was familiar with the pen is shown by the fact that in 1626 he contributed to the fifth volume of *Purchas's Pilgrimes*, a narrative entitled *Relations of the Kingdome of Golehonda and other neighbouring Nations within the Gulte of Bengala*. We know that in 1632 he was in London, for in June of that year he acted as deputy of Humphrey Leigh as swordbearer of the city of London. In the following year, 1633, he was sent by the Company to Surat in an important capacity.⁸

In a letter from William Methold to his wife, written from Surat, December 22, 1634, is a reference to the Mary⁹:

"The affections of my soule contracted into such a quintessence as might be contayned in one poore letter presentes themselves unto thee in a double koppy, the one of them inclosed unto ye hon^{ble} East India Company, the other by Mr. Barker, and yf the royll Mary¹⁰ arrived in safety I make no secret [?] that bothe of them came seasonably to thy handes."

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.
Cornell University.

THE COUNCIL OF REMIREMONT.

In the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* of 1849 (vol. vii, pp. 160–167), G. Waitz published a Latin poem of two hundred and thirty-nine hexameter verses in leonine rhyme, to which he gave the name of *Das Liebesconcil*. The manuscript which he followed seemed to belong to the eleventh or twelfth century. Many years later, in 1877, Waitz printed in the same journal (vol. xxi, pp. 65–68) some emendations to the text, which he had found in a copy made by Pertz from another manuscript. In 1880 B. Hauréau

⁸ *Dictionary of National Biography*.

⁹ British Museum. *Addit. MS. 11,268*.

¹⁰ Cf. f. 347 of the play: "A royal shippe and heaves a royll name."

mentioned the poem—under the title of *Le Concile de Remiremont*—as an imitation of the *Alteratio Phyllidis et Flora*, and assigned it to the fourteenth century.¹ In 1886 Paul Meyer expressed the opinion that it belonged to the first years of the twelfth century.² G. Gröber also pronounces in favor of the twelfth century, but without restricting the time to any part of the century.³

The *Council of Remiremont* is a very interesting specimen of mediæval Latin literature, but its date would be of little consequence were it definitely fixed in the last third of the twelfth century. In that period it would find associates, both in Latin and in the vernacular. Its presence in a fairly numerous company would not be particularly significant. On the other hand, if the *Council* was composed before the Crusade of 1147, or, as Paul Meyer would seem to believe, before Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Britonum*, its position in the literary history of the Middle Ages becomes a commanding one. We would then be compelled to agree with E. Langlois that it is the earliest example of mediæval amatory verse which has come down to us.⁴

Of the dates proposed for the *Council*, the one suggested by Hauréau, of the fourteenth century, is undoubtedly wrong. Pertz, and Waitz too,⁵ can hardly have gone so far astray as to the date of the Trier manuscript. Besides, the ideas advanced by the author of the *Council* are the ideas in vogue under Louis VII and Philip Augustus. It is not probable that they were revived in this one instance under the Valois. For the other extreme, the approximate date mentioned by Paul Meyer, there are objections, if we subscribe to the accepted views of mediæval literature. The sentiments to which the poem gives expression are generally supposed to have been formulated in the courts of France, Champagne and Flanders after the contact of French nobles with Provençal culture, or during the third quarter of the twelfth century. An analysis of the *Council* shows at once how excellent a representative of romantic

literature it is, the romanticism of the Latin Renaissance :

The *Council of Remiremont* is a parody on a church council. It discloses an assembly of women, nuns, not monks, where the deliberations pertain to love, not religion. As the story goes, this council of unusual composition was held during the Ides of April at the abbey of Remiremont in the diocese of Toul. No man was allowed a seat in the assembly, but "honesti clerici" might be spectators. Old women inimical to "gaudium" were also excluded. The proceedings were opened by reading the Gospel according to Ovid, and continued by the singing of love songs. Then a "cardinalis domina" took the chair and asked for silence. She was a royal maiden, a daughter of Spring, clad in a dress of many colors hung with a thousand flowers of May. Addressing all those who gloried in love and in the amatory delights of April and May, she announced herself to be the envoy of Amor, the god of all lovers. Her mission was to visit the nuns of Remiremont and search into their lives. Therefore, all of them should confess what their manner of living was. She would correct them and be indulgent to them.

This address of the "cardinalis domina" was responded to by Elisabeth des Granges, who declared that they all served Amor, and consorted with monks only, a statement which was at once supported by Elisabeth du Faucon. The love of clerks, she said, who are affable, pleasing, honorable men, who know not desertion or slander, but who are expert in love, generous in gifts, is far preferable to the love of knights, as the nuns had found out by bitter experience. This unfavorable opinion is further upheld by Agnes. Knights' love is forbidden, illicit. Then Bertha adds her testimony to the advantage of an alliance of Amor, "juventutis gaudium," with clerks. Finally, the assembly in chorus proclaims its intention to love clerks with the consent of the "cardinalis domina," a consent at once given, for she sees no "useful" lovers save clerks.

But there are a few friends of knights present and they protest against such a verdict. They, for their part, had found the love of knights pleasing. Knights study how they may win their ladies' favors. To accomplish this result they fear

¹ *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits*, etc., vol. xxix, 2, p. 309.

² *Romania*, xv, p. 333.

³ *Grundriss*, II, p. 421.

⁴ *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose*, p. 6.

⁵ See Pertz' *Archiv*, VIII, p. 598.

neither wounds nor death. The clerks' advocates rejoin that knights are fickle and garrulous. They betray their love affairs. Therefore, they would advise that the love of knights be condemned.

The greater number incline to this opinion, and, in obedience to the will of the majority, the "cardinalis domina" orders that nuns who love knights be refused admittance to their circle, until they repent, receive absolution and promise to sin no more. To this general decree she adds other and explicit commands, that nuns must be content with one lover only, under the penalty of the council's ban, and he should be a clerk who will not reveal their secrets. She calls on them to affirm whether or not this is their opinion. All assent, "sedens in concilio." The decree is to be published in churches and cloisters, and anathema will be pronounced on the disobedient. An "Excommunicatio rebellarum," in set terms suited to the language of Pagan mythology, ends the poem.

What light do the contents of the *Council of Remiremont* throw on its place in mediæval literature? They show that allusions to Spring, to April and May, have become conventional in lyric poetry, that "joy" (*gaudium*) in its technical sense, and "joy of youth" (*Amor, deus omnium, juventutis gaudium*, l. 101) have become acclimated in North France, and that Ovid's authority in amatory matters is unquestioned. Of these characteristics, the first marks the verses of William IX, thus dating from the first years of the twelfth century, at least. The second—"joy" in its meaning of love or as an attribute of love—is commonly held to be of Provençal origin—perhaps because of the lack of French documents—and is supposed to have entered into the phraseology of the Northern poets after the Crusade of 1147. For the third, we know that Ovid's erotic works had long been admired by Latin writers. They are cited by French and Provençal poets who wrote towards the middle of the century.⁶ But it is doubtful whether the *Ars amatoria* would have been substituted for the Gospel (*quasi evangelium*) in the early part of the reign of Louis VII,

⁶See Everard's translation of *Cuto* in *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*, no. 47, strophe 74;—*Richeut* (ll. 746-749) in Méon's *Nouveau Recueil*;—Uc Catola and Marca-brun in Appel's *Chrestomathie*, no. 85, ll. 37-39.

or whether indeed the very conception of a parody on church councils would have been tolerated in that devout period. The structure of the *Council* is really one of a debate between women on subjects pertaining to love, a kind of *cour d'amour* held in a convent. Such an idea would rather suit the years when the influence of Eleanor of Poitou and her daughters had become predominant in court circles, or the sixth and seventh decades of the twelfth century. One statement of the nuns, that clerks

Laudant nos in omnibus rithmis atque versibus (l. 146)

would, in fact, better apply to the generation following the Crusade of 1147. For lyric forms, whether in French or Latin, attained variety in North France only after the introduction of Provençal models about that time.

To these inferences in favor of a comparatively late date in the century for the composition of the *Council*, may be added a decisive argument perhaps. When the few nuns who prefer knights to clerks rally to defend their lovers, they advance the claim that in addition to their other merits knights try to win them by their exploits:

Audaces ad prelia sunt pro nostri gratia:
Ut si nos habeant, et si nobis placeant,
Nulla timent aspera, nec mortem, nec vulnera.
(ll. 116-118.)

Here we find the fundamental definition of "cortoisie." The man solicits the woman's love, not the woman the man's. And to please her he does deeds at arms, unhorses all comers at any risk. Furthermore, the passage in the *Council* shows that the idea was fully formed. The stage of its development had passed. Now the particular epoch in which this development is supposed to have taken place is the reign of Henry I of England. The customs of "courteous" society found their first eulogist in Geoffrey of Monmouth towards the end of that reign. They made their appearance in French literature with the *Roman de Thèbes*, for the early *chansons de toile* are not "cortois" in tone. There is therefore no reason to suppose that a poem hailing from Lorraine, which takes the ideal of "cortoisie" for granted, antedates the general acceptance of that ideal by the court circles of the Continent. Rather the contrary would be the case. The poet must have

addressed himself to an audience which fully admitted "cortoisie," at least in this essential respect of winning a lady's favors by deeds at arms.

Another evidence of the presence of a developed "cortois" sentiment may be seen in the commands of the "cardinalis domina" to her nuns concerning their attitude towards their suitors. She bids them keep themselves for clerks only :

Ne vos detis vilibus unquam et militibus
Tactum vestri corporis, vel coxe, vel femoris.
(ll. 185-186.)

Apart from the sensuality of the lines, which would point to the existence of a considerable amount of verse of the same sort, the question naturally suggests itself why "vilibus," a general term, should be used in close contrast with "militibus," the name of a particular class. An obvious answer to this question would be that "vilibus" is a synonym for "villanis," and is substituted here for "villanis" in order to satisfy the requirements of both rhyme and rhythm. Should this assumption be correct, we would then find grouped together the three classes of feudal society, which were recognized by the court poets of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the clerks, the knights, and the villains.

Through internal evidence we are therefore led to this conclusion : The *Council of Remiremont*, with its romantic spirit and amatory sentiment, would come later in the century than *Thèbes* or Wace's *Brut*, and probably later than the first works of Gautier d'Arras and Chrétien de Troyes. To admit that it antedates them would be to reverse the generally received opinions regarding the development of court poetry in North France. We would therefore place the *Council* not earlier than 1160, and preferably not earlier than Chrétien's *la Charrette*. Waitz' statement regarding the date of the Trier manuscript, and Paul Meyer's belief that the *Council* is the product of the generation of Henry I argue against the validity of this conclusion. But we think that a close examination of the manuscript might extend the time limits set by Waitz, and perhaps modify Paul Meyer's attitude toward the question. If it does not, it would then be in order to change our views

regarding the rise of mediæval literature to a somewhat radical extent.

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

MILTON'S 'SPHERE OF FORTUNE.'

For him I reckon not in high estate
Whom long descent of birth,
Or the sphere of fortune raises.

These lines of the Chorus in *Samson Agonistes* (170-172), which seem clear enough at first, lead one on closer examination to ask what Milton meant by 'the sphere of fortune.' In ancient and mediæval tradition it was not by her sphere, but by her wheel, that Fortuna wrought vicissitude in the conditions of men.¹

Praecipitem movet illam rotam, motusque labore
Nulla quies claudit, nec sistunt otia motum.
Nam cum saepe manum dextram labor ille fatiget,
Laeva manus succedit ei, fessaeque sorori
Succurrit, motumque rotae velocius urget.
Cujus turbo rapax, raptus celer, impetus anceps,
Involvens homines, a lapsu turbine nullum
Excipit, et cunctos fati ludibria ferre
Cogit, et in varios homines descendere casus.
Hos premit, hos relevat; hos dejicit, erigit illos.
Summa rotae dum Croesus habet, tenet infima Codrus,
Julius ascendit, descendit Magnus, et infra
Sulla jacet, surgit Marius; sed cardine verso
Sulla reddit, Marius premitur; sic cuncta vicissim
Turbo rapit, variatque vices fortuna voluntas.

On the other hand, the sphere is simply an unemployed accessory of the goddess Fortuna, or, at most, a means of locomotion;² it is 'entweder das Symbol ihres stets wandelbaren Wesens, oder drückt, wenn sie, wie z. B. auf den Wandgemälden, deutlich als Weltkugel erscheint, ihre weltherrschende Macht aus.'³

¹Cf. Tibullus 1. 5. 70; Seneca, *Agamemnon* 71; Boethius, *De Cons. Phil.* 2, Prose 2; Chaucer, *Knight's Tale* 67. The most elaborate description of her wheel is found in Alain de Lille's picture of the goddess and her abode in his allegorical poem, *Anti-Claudianus*, Bk. 8, Ch. 1 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 210. 560). [Cf. *Publ. of the M. L. A.* of A., VIII, 303 f.; *M. L. N.*, VIII, 230 f., 235 f.; *ix*, 95.—J. W. B.]

²Cf. Plutarch, *De Fortuna Romanorum* 4.

³Peter, in Roscher, *Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie* 1. 1505.

The sphere which Milton substitutes for the wheel of Fortune seems not to be any distortion or adaptation of the traditional sphere, but quite a different one, based apparently upon the conception found in Dante. The relevant lines are the following (*Inf. 7. 73-92*) :

Colui lo cui saper tutto trascende,
Fee li cieli, e diè lor chi conduce,
Si che ogni parte ad ogni parte splende,
Distribuendo egualmente la luce :
Similemente agli splendor mondani
Ordinò general ministra e duce,
Che permutasse a tempo li ben vani,
Di gente in gente e d'uno in altro sangue,
Oltre la difension de' senni umani.
.
.
.
Questa provvede, giudica e persegue
Suo regno, come il loro gli altri Dei.
Le sue permutazion non hanno triegue :
Necessità la fa esser veloce,
Si spesso vien chi vicenda consegue.
Quest' è colei ch' è tanto posta in croce
Pur da color che le dovrian dar lode,
Dandole biasmo a torto e mala voce.
Ma ella s' è beata, e ciò non ode :
Con l' altre prime creature lieta
Volve sua spera, e beata si gode.

A better illustration than this of Dante's tolerant attitude towards the ancient mythology could not be cited. It was his belief that the Greeks and Romans, in their ignorance of the true God, had nevertheless recognized, though imperfectly, many of his spiritual agents who control the motions of the spheres, and had worshiped them as their gods and goddesses. This general conception is clearly set forth in the *Convito*, 2. 5 and 6. As Dr. Moore has shown (*Studies in Dante* 1. 163), it appears in primitive form in Plato's *Timaeus*, and is modified by St. Augustine to the general form in which Dante presents it (*De Civitate Dei* 7. 28). But the representation of Fortune as controlling the motions of her proper sphere in the manner of the other gods, seems to be original with Dante, and is the natural corollary of the doctrine which he received from St. Augustine.⁴

If in Milton's sphere of fortune we have an allusion to Dante's attitude towards paganism, it

⁴ Parts of the passage on Fortune in the *Inferno* are founded upon Boethius, *De Cons. Phil.* 2. Met. 1 and Prose 2 (Moore, *Studies in Dante* 1. 285) : but Boethius shows no trace of this conception of Fortune's sphere.

cannot but be interesting, not to say significant, to any student of Milton's relation to the classics. If the allusion is slight, it nevertheless points to the most significant and beautiful line in Dante's description—

Volve sua spera, e beata si gode.

Milton seems never to have been wholly at one with himself about classical myths. He is continually making such use of them as shows a deep appreciation both of their beauty and their truth ; yet he occasionally seems to suffer a revulsion of feeling, and shrinks from them as from something pagan, and therefore diabolical.⁵

Dante's position was at once more catholic and more just than Milton's ; he succeeded in relating the old religion closely and harmoniously to his own. It is pleasant to think that in one of his last allusions to classical mythology, Milton may have been considering an interpretation of paganism which was even nobler than such as he had given.

It may be observed in passing that Milton would not have heard the line,

Necessità la fa esser veloce,

without being reminded of the famous episode in the Tenth Book of the *Republic*, where Necessity and her daughters, the Fates, preside over the revolutions of the spheres. That the episode was a memorable one with him may be inferred from the noble use which he made of it in *Arcades* 61-73, many years before.

CHARLES G. OSGOOD, JR.

Princeton University.

ÉTYMOLOGIES FRANÇAISES.

Cotret = *cort* + *eret* (< -ARCIUS).

Le *Dictionnaire Général* dit que *cotret* (écrit aussi *coteret*) est d'origine inconnue. M. Thomas, dans la précieuse étude qu'il a publiée depuis peu sur le suffixe -ARCIUS,¹ a indiqué l'origine du

⁵ *P. L.* 1. 506-525 ; *P. R.* 2. 174-191.

¹ Antoine Thomas, *Nouveaux essais de philologie française*, Paris, 1904, pp. 83-84.

mot pris dans ses deux sens techniques, en ajoutant que *cotret* au sens de "fagot de menu bois" est moins facile à expliquer ; toutefois, il semble croire que dans ce sens aussi, *cotret* aurait la même étymologie que dans les sens techniques, c'est-à-dire représenterait *COSTA + ARICUS*, et il cite à ce sujet l'opinion de M. Tobler qui "suppose que le mot s'est d'abord appliqué aux rondins qui soutiennent les côtés des voitures, puis aux rondins d'un fagot, puis au fagot lui-même."

Je m'imagine que l'histoire du mot est plus simple. D'abord, l's de la forme *costerez*, le plus ancien exemple rapporté par le *Dictionnaire Général*, ne doit pas faire illusion, puisque la date, 1332, permet de considérer cette lettre comme purement graphique. Ensuite, ce qui caractérise surtout ce fagot, c'est qu'il est *court* ainsi que les bâtons qui le composent. Or, si l'on ajoute à l'ancienne forme *cort* le représentant français du suffixe *-ARICUS*, on a **corterez*² qui peut sans doute avoir perdu la première *r* par simple dissimilation ; mais, ayant égard à ce qu'exprime notre vocabulaire et par conséquent à sa nature rustique, il est plus probable que nous avons affaire à un cas d'amuïssemement par assimilation de la dentale vibrante à la dentale explosive qui la suit. L'amuïssemement de l'*r* dans ces conditions devait être un phénomène accompli au treizième et quatorzième siècles dans la plupart des dialectes ou patois qui présentent de nos jours cette particularité. On trouve le même phénomène de phonétique dans deux dérivés de l'adjectif *court* enregistrés par Littré, à savoir *coutauder*, pour *courtauder*, et *couston* (l's ne se prononce pas), forme dialectale de *courton* "brins courts de chanvre."³ *Cotret* donc, quand il désigne un fagot court ou un des courts bâtons qui le composent, n'est qu'une forme dialectale de ce qui serait en français normal **courteret*, et l's de l'orthographe du moyen âge n'est que le résultat d'une confusion avec *costerez* dérivé de *coste*.

² Cf. la forme féminine *corterece* dans le livre précité de M. Thomas, p. 360.

³ Cependant le *Dictionnaire Général*, s. v. *courton*, dit que "quelques dictionnaires donnent à tort *couston* dans le même sens." Je suis d'avis, au contraire, qu'on doit voir dans cette dernière forme une prononciation dialectale de la première, et que l's n'a été introduite dans la graphie que par confusion avec un mot différent, *couton* (= v. fr. *coston* et prov. mod. *coustoun*).

Dèche < **DISTICA* (*διστυχα*).

On n'a pas fait accueil, et pour cause, à l'explication du mot *dèche* "misère, manque d'argent" par quelque dérivé de *debere*, explication que Scheler avait proposée dubitativement. Dans le *Larousse* se trouve une histoire de pure fantaisie selon laquelle ce mot serait redévable de la vie à la prononciation fautive du mot *déception* par un acteur allemand. Quant au *Dictionnaire Général*, il dit que c'est peut-être un substantif verbal de *déchoir*, ce qui ne serait phonétiquement possible que par abrégement argotique de *déchet*, comme dans *occase* pour *occasion*.

Pour confirmer les doutes qu'on peut avoir sur cette origine, on n'a qu'à comparer *dèche* au mot *dètse* qui se trouve dans le glossaire du patois des Fourgs (Doubs) et qui est ainsi conçu : "Dètse, s. f., accident, dommage, blessure ; *sin mau et sin dètse*, sans mal et sans dommage."⁴ Voilà bien, je crois, le même mot et qui ne fait pas l'effet d'un emprunt récent à l'argot parisien, car, pour ne rien dire des significations, la phrase toute faite qui est citée a l'air de venir de loin, et il y a bonne chance que *dèche*, *dètse* ait appartenu au plus ancien fond de la langue.

Je voudrais proposer pour ce mot une étymologie qui est inattaquable sous le double rapport de la phonétique et de la sémantique. Les dictionnaires grecs nous font savoir qu'on employait au lieu du substantif *αἱ δυστυχίαι*, le neutre pluriel de l'adjectif *δυστυχής*, c'est-à-dire *τὰ δυστυχῆ* : le sens "malheur, besoin, misère" est le même que celui de *dèche*, *dètse*. Adopté par le latin populaire comme substantif féminin singulier, ainsi que d'autres neutres pluriels grecs, *δυστυχῆ* serait devenu **DISTICA* selon les lois de l'accentuation latine. On trouve même pour l'adjectif grec, au lieu de *δυστυχής*, -*és*, la forme *δύστυχος*, -*ov*, dont le neutre pluriel *δύστυχα* serait encore plus proche de la forme latine proposée. **DISTICA* en passant par **desca*, **desche* devient *dèche* en français, tandis que dans le patois des Fourgs il doit donner *dètse*, tout comme dans le même patois *lisca* donne *lètse* et *piscat* donne *pètse*.⁵

On doit ajouter que si le mot n'existe à Paris que depuis une date assez récente, ce qui paraît

⁴ *Mém. de la Soc. d'émul. du Doubs*, 1864, p. 258.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 300 et 324.

bien probable, et qu'il ne vienne pas du territoire francien, rien n'empêcherait qu'on l'eût apporté de la Franche-Comté même, car les habitants de cette province doivent naturellement franciser *dëtse en dëche* selon la correspondance de *pïtse*, *pêche* et *lëtse*, *laïche*.

Palier < *PEDALARUM.

Le *Dictionnaire Général* dit que le mot *palier* est d'origine inconnue, mais il fait justement observer que la plus ancienne forme enregistrée par Godefroy dans une citation de 1328 est *paalier*, c'est-à-dire trissyllabe, et par conséquent distincte de *pailier*; pour la même raison on doit refuser de suivre Scheler et d'y voir un dérivé de *pala*.

Je crois que *palier* vient d'une forme du latin populaire *PEDALARUM qui fut faite sur *pedalem* et dont l'existence est attestée sous la forme féminine dans le provençal *pesaliera*, *pesalieiro*. Le *Tresor de Mistral* donne pour ce mot la définition que voici : "sablière, semelle, pièce de charpente qui porte le pied des chevrons." La même idée "pièce de support" est précisément celle qu'exprime le français *palier* quand il est employé comme terme de mécanique, ce qui est le cas pour tous les exemples du mot cités par Godefroy s. v. *paaillier*. Notons ici que l'anglais emploie le mot *pedestal* avec la signification de "palier de machine." En latin on avait déjà appelé *podium* une plate-forme élevée à laquelle on aurait pu assimiler un palier d'escalier, mais on avait vu surtout dans ce dernier une marche comme les autres, quoique plus large, entre deux volées d'escalier, et il aurait été difficile de lui donner un nom plus convenable que *pedalarium. La même idée sémantique se retrouve dans l'allemand *Podest*, *Pedest*, le moyen haut allemand *Grède*, et le provençal *trepadou* qui signifient tous "palier d'escalier," et aussi dans l'anglais *foot-pace* "demi-palier."

Sous le rapport de la phonétique en trouvera peu à redire dans la série *PEDALARUM > *pedalier > *pealier > paalier > palier. De *paalier* on a eu, par deux dissimulations différentes des voyelles contiguës, *poalier* et *paelier*, formes citées par Godefroy, la dernière dans le *Supplément* à l'article *palier*. Les autres formes que l'on trouve dans Godefroy s. v. *poaillier* ne sont que des variantes orthographiques de *poalier*. On

pourrait objecter à la série que la contrefinale de *PEDALARUM devrait donner régulièrement *e* et non *a*; cependant la règle n'est pas sans exceptions, comme, par exemple, dans *échalier* < *ISCALARUM. D'ailleurs le représentant de PEDALEM a presque sûrement existé en ancien français — il existe en provençal, comme on peut le voir à l'article *pesal* dans Mistral — et puisqu'il s'agit du suffixe *-alis*, on aurait donc pu former ou refaire *pealier sur *peal (pour *peel) comme on a fait *journalier* sur *jornal* (pour *jornel*). Au cas où *peel, *peal n'auraient pas existé, on peut expliquer l'*a* de la contrefinale par l'influence des autres dérivés de *pedem* (*peage*, *peaigne*, *peason*) qui avaient un *a* entravé. Cette influence pu avoir lieu surtout à l'époque où, le *d* intercalique n'étant pas encore amuï, on avait conscience de la parenté du groupe.

Sablière < *SAPPINARIA.

Sablière, "pièce de bois sur laquelle reposent les chevrons, les pieds des étais, etc.," est d'origine inconnue, selon le *Dictionnaire Général*. Littré cite *SCAPULARIA et *STABILIARIA, étymologies proposées, l'une par Ménage, l'autre par Scheler, mais il reconnaît qu'elles sont inacceptables.

Je crois que *sablière* représente le développement rigoureusement phonétique du latin *SAPPINARIA (de *sappinus*), à savoir *SAPPINARIA > *sap'naria > *sab'naria > *sablaria > *sablière*. Au groupe *bn*, inconnu dans la prononciation du latin populaire de la Gaule, s'est naturellement substitué un groupe connu, *bl* plutôt que *br* à cause de la présence de *r* dans le suffixe -ARIA. Ce phénomène de substitution, le même qui explique l'*r* des mots français *coffre*, *timbre*, etc., est fréquent dans les langues indo-européennes comme le démontrent les exemples qu'en a donnés M. Maurice Grammont dans son livre sur la dissimilation consonantique.⁶

Il va sans dire que *sapinière* a été fait sur *sapin* comme *savonnière* a été fait sur *savon*. Je ne connais pas d'autres mots français qui présentent les mêmes conditions phonétiques, mais je n'en suis

⁶ M. Grammont, *La Dissimilation consonantique dans les langues indo-européennes et dans les langues romanes*, Dijon, 1895, pp. 138-140.

pas moins d'avis qu'on doit compléter la loi pour *b* (non initial) + *consonne* en constatant que dans le groupe *bn*, *b* ne s'amuit pas comme le donnent à entendre toutes les grammaires historiques françaises, mais qu'il persiste par le passage de *bn* à *bl* ou *br*.

Comme *sappinus*, selon Forcellini, paraît avoir désigné originairement non une espèce d'arbres, mais les gros bois de construction tirés de la partie inférieure du tronc de plusieurs espèces d'arbres, l'étymologie que je propose pour *sablière* n'en est que plus assurée.

Litré donne encore au mot *sablière* la définition suivante qui ne se trouve point dans le *Dictionnaire Général* : "Bateau jaugeant au moins cinq tonneaux sur le canal du Midi." Je constate dans Littré et dans Larousse que *sapinière*, *sapine* et *sapinette* désignent aussi des sortes de bateaux. *Sablière* dans ce sens aussi, vient encore bien probablement de *SAPPINARIA ; du moins je ne trouve pas qu'on ait appelé ces bateaux de ce nom parce qu'ils servent à transporter le sable.

C. A. MOSEMILLER.

Indiana University.

SCOTT'S *IVANHOE* AND SYDNEY'S *ARCADIA*.

Attention has never been called, I believe, to the correspondences between Scott's *Ivanhoe* and Sydney's *Arcadia*. That there are correspondences which are neither slight nor casual, will appear from a comparison of the two works. The broad fact that both romances deal largely with chivalry of course renders probable some general resemblances. Another common general feature of the two works is that, with chivalry, scenes of pastoral life are combined. This is a less conspicuous element in the later romance, but it is there, in the famous first scene, for example, and elsewhere. Again, the scenes of outlawry and the general state of society correspond : Sherwood Forest and Arcadia are strikingly similar. If, then, we compare these works, we shall find that in the main action of each there are three chief moments : the tournaments, the capture and imprisonment of the heroines and hero, and the

siege. Let us note the agreeing circumstances in regard to each.

I. THE TOURNAMENTS : (Ar. 1, 16 seqq. ; Iv. 8 seqq.)—¹

Each is of two days' continuance. In the *Arcadia*, Pyrocles enters disguised in rusty poorness of apparel the second day, after the overthrow of many Arcadian knights. The spectators have already measured his length on the earth when he rides up and strikes the shield of the challenger (1, 17. 5).

Ivanhoe enters after the day seems lost to the Saxons. He is splendidly appalled, but is disguised, and his shield bears a device and word signifying "Disinherited." He rides straight up and strikes the shield of the challenger until it rings again. In both combats the challenger is unhorsed by the breaking of his saddle girth (Ar. 1, 17. 7 ; Iv. 8. 86). In each story there is a Black Knight, although the parts played are different. In the *Arcadia*, the Black Knight smites the shield of the challenger just an instant after Pyrocles, and therefore misses his opportunity to fight (17. 5). In the later story, the Black Knight assists Ivanhoe when the odds are against him (12. 126).

Each tournament is followed by miscellaneous sports and contests. (Ar. 1, 19 ; Iv. 13. 134). Corresponding to the Eclogues in the earlier work are the ballads in the later (17. 169, 171). Before leaving this topic, the horsemanship of Ivanhoe (8. 84 ; 9. 91) should be compared with that of Sidney's second hero, Musidorus, II, 5. 3.

II. THE CAPTURE AND IMPRISONMENT : (Ar. III, 2 seqq. ; Iv. 19 seqq.)—

In the *Arcadia*, the two heroines, Philoclea and Pamela, and the hero, Pyrocles, are taken captive at a rural festival in the woods and are lodged in Cecropia's castle. The design of the captor is to make one of the young ladies the wife of Amphialus, Cecropia's son (III, 2). In *Ivanhoe*, the two heroines together with the hero of the story and others are taken captive and lodged in the castle of Front de Boeuf, who has designs upon Rebecca and Ivanhoe (19). Compare the separation and

¹ References are to Cross's *Ivanhoe* (Scribner's) by chapter and page ; and to Sommer's *Arcadia*, facsimile reprint (London, 1901) by book, chapter, and paragraph.

disposal of the captives : Ar. III, 2. 5 and 21. 4 ; Iv. 21. 201 seq.

The ordeals of the heroines are similar in the two stories. In the *Arcadia*, Amphialus goes to the chamber of Philoclea and woes her to become his wife (III, 3. 1 seqq.). Note how he has bedecked himself with the most costly apparel : a garment of "black velvet richly embroidered with great pearl," and "about his necke he ware a brode and gorgeous coller." In *Ivanhoe*, De Bracy enters Rowena's chamber and offers to make her his wife (23. 218 seqq.). He has "decorated his person with all the foppery of the times." He wears "a richly furred cloak," and his girdle is "embroidered and embossed with gold work."

Each suitor is the captive of his prisoner (Ar. III, 6. 6 ; Iv. 23. 219). The imprisonment in each case is gallantly ascribed to the beauty of the prisoner.

Amphialus says : "It is you your selfe, that imprisons your selfe : it is your beautie which makes these castle-walls embrace you (3. 5). De Bracy says : "To thyself, fair maid, to thine own charms be ascribed whatever I have done which passed the respect due to her whom I have chosen queen of my heart and loadstar of my eyes" (219).

The scene of gallantry and comparative honorableness only prepares in each instance for the scene of lawless passion. In the *Arcadia* (III, 26. 7), Anaxius, of might and terror in arms like Brian de Bois-Guilbert, seeks to win Pamela to be his paramour : "And withall, going to Pamela, and offring to take her by the chin, 'And as for you, Minion (said he) yeeld but gently to my will,'" etc. Whereupon Pamela thus rebuffs him : "Proud beast," etc. In *Ivanhoe* (24. 227), the sybil had exclaimed : "Thy life, Minion : what would thy life pleasure them ?" This prepares for the scene in which Brian de Bois-Guilbert makes his dis-honorable proposals (230 seqq.).

III. THE SIEGE : Ar. III, 7 seqq. ; Iv. 29 seqq.).

In each story a Black Knight leads the besiegers and distinguishes himself for prowess in arms. Ar. III, 8. 4 : "Into the presse comes . . . a Knight in armor as darke as blacknes coulde make it, followed by none, and adorned by nothing But vertue quickly made him knowne."

Iv. 29. 289 : "'A Knight, clad in sable armor, is the most conspicuous,' said the Jewess ; 'he seems to assume the direction of all around him.'"

Scott's Black Knight is afterwards recognized to be Richard Cœur-de-Lion, and Sidney's proves to be his second hero, Musidorus, the friend of Pyrocles and lover of Pamela (Ar. III, 18. 10).

Minor Circumstances of the Sieges :—1. Compare the challenges (Ar. III, 13. 2 and 6 ; Iv. 25. 239 and 243). The ludicrous element is possessed in common by them, although the purport of the two is different.

2. Within each castle is a friend of the besiegers, in each instance a woman : Artesia in Cecropia's (III, 14) and Ulrica in Front de Boeuf's.

3. Compare the ludicrous combat between Clinias and Dametas (Ar. III, 13), and that between Gurth and the miller (Iv. 11). Each is a comic interlude introduced in accordance with the same principles of art. Two other incidents related in each story remain to be noticed. The first is an act of knightly courtesy. In Scott's romance the incident of Ivanhoe's refusal to take advantage, in the lists, when his opponent's horse, by rearing and plunging, disturbed the rider's aim, will be recalled. Ivanhoe wheeled his horse, and having ridden back to his own end, gave his antagonist the chance of a second encounter (8. 87). In the *Arcadia* (III, 16. 4) : "But when his staffe was in his rest, comming down to meet with the Knight, now verie neere him, he perceyved the Knight had mist his rest : wherefore the curteous Amphialus woulde not let his Launce descende," etc.

The second incident is the resuscitation of characters at the convenience of the writer. This is no infrequent device of the Greek romances, whence Sidney borrowed it. It occurs some three or four times in the *Arcadia* : II, 8. 10 ; 9. 1 ; III, 21. 4, and 22. 5 : explanation of the last, 23 (erroneously written 17), 3. Compare also II, 3. 5. The celebrated bringing to life again of Athelstane might well have been suggested by Sidney's examples.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS POINTS.—*Ivanhoe* opens with the scene of the swine-herd Gurth and the clown Wamba : the *Arcadia* opens with the scene of the two shepherds, Strephon and Claius. That is, both openings are pastoral.

Of the heroes, in the *Arcadia*, Musidorus, who is heir to the throne of Thessalia and Pyrocles, his cousin and friend, heir of the throne of Macedon, have filled Asia with the renown of their unexampled valor. In *Ivanhoe*, the Asiatic exploits of Richard, heir to the throne of England, and Ivanhoe, his friend and heir of Rutherford Grange, form a similar background for the real action of the story.

In each work the counterpart of the chivalry of the heroes is the chastity of the heroines.

Disguises and recognitions are notable features of both works. In the earlier romance Pyrocles can have opportunity to woo Philoclea only by disguising himself; and in disguise he enters the tourney. Ivanhoe only by the favor of his disguise gets an interview with Rowena, and in disguise he tilts in the lists at Ashby. Other disguises and consequent recognitions occur in both stories.

ROBERT T. KERLIN.

New Haven, Conn.

VARIOUS NOTES.

CARLYLE, *SARTOR RESARTUS* 2. 9.

One of Carlyle's memorable passages is this (*Sartor Resartus* 2. 9, ed. MacMechan, p. 173): 'The Fraction of Life can be increased in value not so much by increasing your Numerator as by lessening your Denominator. Nay, unless my Algebra deceive me, Unity itself divided by Zero will give Infinity. Make thy claim of wages a zero, then; thou hast the world under thy feet. Well did the Wisest of our time write: "It is only with Renunciation (*Entsagen*) that Life, properly speaking, can be said to begin."

It is rather surprising to find that this is a doctrine, not of the Stoics, but of Epicurus himself. Seneca says (*Ep.* 21. 7): "Si vis," inquit [Epicurus], "Pythoclea divitem facere, non pecuniae adjiciendum, sed cupiditati detrahendum est." To the same effect Stobaeus, *Flor.* 17. 37: 'Ἐπίκουρος ἐρωτηθεὶς πῶς ἀν τις πλούτησιεν; 'οὐ τοῖς οὖσι προστιθεὶς' ἔφη 'τῆς δὲ χρείας τὰ πολλὰ περιτέμνων.' And so *Flor.* 17. 24, where the saying is again

ascribed to Epicurus: Εἰ βούλει πλούσιόν τινα ποιῆσαι, μὴ χρήμασιν προστίθει, τῆς δὲ ἐπιθυμίας ἀφαιρεῖ. A somewhat similar saying is attributed to Socrates (*Flor.* 17. 30).

In Regnard's *Le Joueur* (1696), Act 5, Sc. 13, the valet, Hector, reading to his master from Seneca, 'Chapitre six. Du mépris des richesses,' concludes:

'C'est posseder les biens que savoir s'en passer.'
Que ce mot est bien dit! et que c'est bien penser!
Ce Sénèque, monsieur, est un excellent homme.

King, *Class. and For. Quot.*, No. 299, adds, from Vigée's *Épître à Duccis sur les Avantages de la Médiocrité*:

Je suis riche du bien dont je sais me passer.

CHAUCER, *PARL. FOULES* 353.

In confirmation of my view with regard to *foules*, published in *Mod. Lang. Notes* for April, 1906, Dr. A. E. H. Swaen, of the University of Groningen, calls my attention to the fact that in the Wright-Wülcker *Vocabularies*, *bēo* occurs with the names of birds in the following places: 261. 9; 318. 34; 543. 7, the first time in a section headed *De Avibus*.

BEOWULF 1408 ff.

In *Mod. Lang. Notes* 17. 209-10 (418-9) I called attention to the parallel between *Beow.* 1408 ff. and Seneca, *Herc. Fur.* 762-3. To the latter passage I now wish to add certain others. A handy translation is that of Miss Harris (*The Tragedies of Seneca*, Henry Frowde, 1904). The first is Seneca, *Œd.* 530-547:

Est procul ab urbe lucus illicibus niger,
Diræa circa vallis irrigua loca.
Cupressus altis exserens silvis caput
Virente semper alligat trunco nemus;
Curvosque tendit quercus et putres situ
Annosa ramos. Hujus abrupit latus
Edax vetustas; illa jam fessa cadens
Radice, fulta pendet aliena trabe.
Amara baccas laurus, et tiliæ leves,
Et Paphia myrtus, et per immensum mare
Motura remos alnus, et Phœbo obvia,
Enode Zephyrus pinis opponens latus.

Medio stat ingens arbor, atque umbra gravi
 Silvas minores urget, et magno ambitu
 Diffusa ramos, una defendit nemus.
 Tristis sub illa lucis et Phoebi inscius
 Restagnat humor, frigore aeterno rigens.
 Limosa pigrum circuit fontem palus.

Another is *Thy.* 649–655, 664–6¹:

A barren detested vale, you see it is ;
 The trees, though summer, yet forlorn and lean,
 O'ercome with moss and baleful mistletoe ;
 Here never shines the sun ; here nothing breeds
 Unless the nighty owl or fatal raven.

But straight they told me they would bind me here
 Unto the body of a dismal yew.

See Cunliffe, *The Influence of Shakespeare on Elizabethan Tragedy*, p. 70.

Arcana in imo regia secessu patet,
 Alta vetustum valle compescens nemus,
 Penetrale regni, nulla qua letos solet
 Præbere ramos arbor, aut ferro colo ;
 Sed taxus, et cupressus, et nigra ilice
 Obscura nutat silva ; quam supra eminens
 Despectat alte quercus, et vincat nemus.

 Fons stat sub umbra tristis, et nigra piger
 Haeret palude ; talis est diræ Stygis
 Deformis unda, que facit cœlo fidem.

A third is from the context to the passage quoted in the earlier article. This is *Herc. Fur.* 662–3, 683–6, 689–90 :

Spartana tellus nobile attollit jugum,
 Densis ubi aequor Tænarus silvis premit.

 Qualis incerta vagus
 Maeander unda ludit, et cedit sibi,
 Instatque, dubius, littus an fontem petat.
 Palus inertis foeda Cocti jacet.

 Horrent opaca fronde nigrantes comeæ
 Taxo imminente, quam tenet segnis Sopor.

Various passages from Latin poets on hell and its rivers might be adduced. Among them are the following :

Lucan, *Phars.* 6. 639–646 :

Haud procul a Ditis cæcis depressis cavernis
 In præceps subsedit humus, quam pallida pronis
 Urget silva comis, et nullo vertice cælum

Suspiciens Phebo non pervia taxus opacat.
 Marcentes intus tenebræ, squalensque sub antris
 Longa nocte situs, nunquam, nisi carmine factum,
 Lumen habet.

Silius Italicus, *Pun.* 13. 563–4, 568–573, 595–6 :

Tum jacet in spatiū sine corpore pigræ vorago,
 Limosique lacus.

 At, magnis semper divis regique deorum
 Intrari dignata palus, picis horrida rivo,
 Fumiferum volvit Styx inter sulphura limum.
 Tristior hic Acheron sanie crassoque veneno
 Aestuat, et, gelidam eructans cum murmure arenam,
 Descendit nigra lenta per stagna palude.

 Dextra vasta comas nemorosaque brachia fundit
 Taxus, Cocti rigua frondosior unda.

Also 12. 126–8 :

Huic vicina palus (fama est, Acherontis ad undas
 Pandere iter) cæcus stagnante voragine fauces
 Laxat, et horrendos aperit telluris hiatus.

Ovid, *Met.* 4. 432–4 :

Est via declivis funesta nubila taxo ;
 Dicit ad infernas per muta silentia sedes.
 Styx nebulas exhalat iners.

Virgil, *Georg.* 4. 478–480 :

Quos circum limus niger et deformis harundo
 Cocti tardaque palus inamibilis unda
 Alligat, et noviens Styx interfusa coeret.

Virgil, especially in the Sixth Book of the *Æneid*, is the source for all later Latin poets, so far as the description of Hades is concerned. Dieterich says (*Nekyia*, pp. 158–9) : 'Vergil hat den Anstoss gegeben zu den zahlreichen Hades-schilderungen der römischen Dichter, die bis in Einzelheiten von ihm abhängig sind. . . . Selten wird auch mit Sicherheit auszumachen sein, woher sie die abweichenden Einzelheiten haben.' He then refers to G. Ettig, *Acheruntica*, pp. 360 ff., especially for the relevant passages in Seneca, Lucan, Silius, and Statius.

Yale University.

ALBERT S. COOK.

¹ This is perhaps reflected in Shakespeare, *Tit. Andr.* 2. 3. 93–7, 106–7 :

NOTES ON CALDERON: THE VERA
TASSIS EDITION; THE TEXT OF
LA VIDA ES SUEÑO.

Ticknor has aptly remarked that the Vera Tassis edition is to Calderon what the First Folio of his plays is to Shakespeare. Its importance has, in fact, never been questioned. But all who have attempted to write the bibliographical history of the edition have approached the task with insufficient first-hand information and little critical discernment. A census of extant copies is a desideratum. Breymann, Calderon's most recent bibliographer, has seen a sufficient number to enable him to present something like a trustworthy account of the chronological order of their publication. Unfortunately, like the merest tyro, he has contented himself with noting, in superficial manner, the title-pages, without reading carefully approbations and prologues. He seems, indeed, to be ignorant of any difficulties.

My sole purpose in broaching the matter now, is to call attention to certain obvious errors and seeming inconsistencies, in the hope that some one may be induced to prepare a full and reliable bibliography.

Ticknor's account, it may be noted in passing, errs in minor details, owing to the fact that several of his copies were not first editions.¹ It was for this reason, likewise, that he fixed the posterior date of publication at 1694, instead of 1691. The first volume to appear was *Parte V*, 1682. It is doubtful whether another volume was issued that year. Morel-Fatio has expressed the opinion that at least six volumes were published in 1682,—Breymann indicates as many. The second part to appear was, apparently, Vol. vi, 1683. La Barrera first noted an edition of 1682. Such a volume has not been found by Salvá, Hartzenbusch, Morel-Fatio, or Breymann. La Barrera was an accurate and painstaking bibliographer; it can be said, however, with dogmatic assurance, supported by irrefutable evidence, that

¹ I, 1685; II, 1686; III, 1687; IV, 1688; V, 1694; VI, 1683; VII, 1683; VIII, 1684; IX, 1691. I have the following volumes of the Vera Tassis edition: I, 1726; II, 1726; III, 1726; V, 1730; VI, 1715; VII, 1715; VIII, 1726; IX, 1698.

he erred in assigning Vol. I to 1682. If this can be proven, then there is a possibility that he was, likewise, wrong in his bibliography of Vol. VI. When Vera Tassis asked permission to print parts I, II, III, IV, he stated that the former privilege had expired in the previous year, *ochenta y dos*,—he refers to the fact that a privilege (for ten years) had been granted for the *Quarta parte*, June 18, 1672. This then makes the publication of Vol. I impossible before 1683; the earliest copy known is dated 1685. In this edition of 1685 *el rey* states,—and such a document would not be altered,—that parts V, VI, VII, had already appeared, and that part VIII was in preparation. In the *al que leyere*, Vera Tassis adds that he hopes to publish soon II, III, IV, IX, X. It will be noted that, according to this statement, Vol. I appeared before Vol. II. Here arises a difficulty. The *Biblioteca Nacional* has a copy of Vol. II, dated 1683. This copy Breymann has apparently seen. If the title-page is correct, then, of course, Vol. I, likewise, appeared in 1683, as, also, VI, VII. This is quite possible, so far as Vol. VI is concerned. Breymann says, referring to the unique copy of the 1683 edition of the *Sexta parte*:

“Die Druckerlaubnisse sind vom Jahre 1682. Daher erklärt sich wohl die jedenfalls irrite Angabe La Barrera's, dasz die sexta parte bereits im Jahre 1682 erschienen sei.”

I have recently had an opportunity of examining the Ticknor copy of Vol. VII, which has always been dated 1683. That is, indeed, the date on the title-page. But the volume did not appear until 1684, the *fe de errata* being signed in *Enero ocho de mil y seiscientos y ochenta y quatro años*, and the *suma de la tassa*, likewise, in the same year (1684). The work had apparently been printed in 1683.

In Vol. VIII (*suma de la tassa*, October 16, 1684) Vera Tassis says:

“El Octavo tomo . . . y Quarto en orden de los que mi cuidadosa tarea ha publicado . . . Las demás [comedias] que en mi poder quedan están en sus traslados tan inciertos que hasta conseguir otros mas verdaderos avré de suspender el proseguir en el Noueno tomo: passando à repetir en la Prensa los quattro Primeros . . .”

This has been accepted as the first edition of Vol. VIII; but that is impossible if the 1683 edition of Vol. II is genuine or correctly dated.

D. Gaspar Augustín de Lara, writing in the

Obelisco funebre . . . (1684) refers to only parts v, vi, vii, "aviendo valido," he adds, "al Im- presor (como dizen todos los libreros) en menos de un año, mas de tres mil ducados, sacada la costa de la impresion." When this was written, I do not know,² but it must have been written in 1683, or 1684, conclusive proof, at least, that parts i, ii, iii, iv, were not reprinted in 1682; in other words, that not more than three volumes could possibly have appeared in 1682. I may note, finally, that a (new?) *suma del privilegio* was obtained for at least parts iii, iv, July, 1684, whether or not for parts i, ii, I cannot, at present state. How to reconcile this with the existence of an edition of the *Quarta parte*, 1683, in the University Library, Madrid, is another problem which confronts the bibliographer.

Much has been written about Vera Tassis. We owe him gratitude for rescuing plays that might have perished. But one may be pardoned for questioning the sincerity of his persistent claims to the friendship of Don Pedro. In such matters sinister and crooked motives are implied by over-insistence. Certainly, *les amis de mes amis sont mes amis*, was not a maxim to the liking of Vera Tassis. There is reason to believe that Vergara was befriended by Calderon. None the less, Vera Tassis speaks of his "vana ostentación de amigo de nuestro Don Pedro;" and yet Calderon had referred to him in 1664, as "mi mas apassionado amigo," had permitted him to publish some plays, nay, to "restaurarlas de los achacados errores." And why does Vera Tassis never mention Calderon's other warm friends, Lara and Veragua? To the latter he had sent a list of his plays, used (?) but not mentioned by Vera Tassis. Why, one may ask, was Vera Tassis not among the number of Calderon's guests, on the author's last birthday, when the latter chatted reminiscently of his youth? Nay, "yo que fui quien mas entrañablemente amé a Don Pedro" neither knew the precise day nor year of Calderon's birth! He states that the author was born January 1st ("día de la Santissima Circuncisión") instead of January 17th; 1601, instead of 1600. All this he avers, pompously, "consta de la Fè de Bau-

tismo. . . ." Don Juan Baños de Velasco alone refers to Vera Tassis as Calderon's "intimo amigo." This same writer speaks of Vera Tassis as "mi Amigo." (*Aprobacion* to Vol. vi). But nowhere does Calderon even mention his editor—although the latter published two of Calderon's plays in 1679. For my part, I cannot help thinking that Vera Tassis was a self-styled friend. The mixture of a lie was to serve as an adamant for commercial advantage. Much can be inferred from Lara's innuendo, where he is, unquestionably, speaking words of truth and throwing a little light upon what was, apparently, at the time, a kind of literary scandal. Referring to the so-called *Verdadera quinta parte*, he asks, why, if the *Congregación de el Glorioso Apostol* had been made Calderon's literary executor, were parts v, vi, vii, not published by that body? Moreover, alluding specifically to the *advertencias* in the *Quinta parte*, where Vera Tassis is at great pains to prove his intimacy with the author, Lara gives him the lie direct, adding:

"Aunque, D. Pedro Calderon padeció los penosos habituales achaques de la edad, hasta el vltimo aliento de la vida, le conservó el cielo tan sano el juicio, que se desmintió humano, si en los aciertos de su muerte se acreditó Diuino; que es al contrario de lo que leo en las aduertencias de la verdadera Quinta Parte, pues dicen, que su achacosa edad no permitió pudiese hacer entero juicio de sus comedias . . . y quien podrá auer que se persuada, que la memoria de todas las comedias que se ponen en la verdadera quinta Parte están rubricadas de Don Pedro, quando el mismo confiesa, que las desconocía por el contexto, y por los titulos; (and, he continues, referring to Vera Tassis' edition,) imprimiendo en nombre de Don Pedro lo que no le passó por el pensamiento escriuir."

Be this all as it may, there can be no doubt whatsoever that Vera Tassis' editions have no more critical value than earlier ones. Morel-Fatio has pointed this out in his edition of *El Mágico Prodigioso*, and it can be shown, perhaps more conclusively, in the case of *La vida es sueño*. Calderon, largely for conscientious scruples, was indifferent to the publication of his comedias. The autos alone he considered worthy of appearing in print. In 1672 he wrote, in the prologue of the *Quarta parte*, to an anonymous friend:

"Si veis que ya no las busco [i. e., the comedias] para embarcarlas, sino para consumarlas, como me aconsejais el aumentarlas [i. e., in print]?"

² Why does Menéndez y Pelayo, in his *Calderon y su teatro*, p. 49, state that Lara's work was printed 1681?

As a consequence, resort had to be taken to unreliable prints or *traslados*. Even the autographs are defective, inasmuch as they are, to use Calderon's expression, mere *borradores*, not intended for reading. It seems incredible, however, that Calderon should, time and again, protest that none of the editions of his works were correct,—not even the two volumes published by his brother? But Don Pedro had the odd notion that such of his plays as were not correctly printed were not his; none the less, he acknowledged as his those printed in the first four parts! All of them, undoubtedly, abound in errors. It is evident that the author gave little or no assistance to his editors, much less did he read the proofs. Lara could truly say, "Calderon published not a single play."

The rest of this note will be limited to a consideration of the relative value of the three texts of *La vida es sueño*: (A) published by the author's brother, 1636; (B) printed surreptitiously in Vol. xxx of *Comedias famosas de Varios autores*, 1636, presumably at Zaragoza, but doubtless at Madrid; (C) Vera Tassis' edition, in the *Primera Parte* (1685?). Second editions of A-B need not be considered here.

It is obvious at the outset, that, will or nill, Joseph Calderon's text must serve as a basis, for future critical editions. The piratical edition differs very considerably. There are additions and omissions, and hardly a line is identical. But in some cases its readings must be accepted. It may have been printed from an actor's copy,³ or it may have been taken down verbatim at the theater. A few illustrations will demonstrate the value of B:

- 1. 326, A. y una rueda que las pare.
B. una rienda que las pare?
- 1. 347, A. Y si humildad y soberbia
no te obligan, personajes
que han movido y removido
mil Autos Sacramentales.
- B. y si humildad y soberbia
no te mueuen . . .
- 1. 448, A. es de materia tan facil. BC, fragil.

³It is interesting to note that Calderon states that actors were not permitted to dispose of their copies for publication. If they did, it was in garbled form, lest their dishonesty be detected. (Cf. his letter to Veragua.)

It would be interesting to know how Vera Tassis retouched (*retocó*) the play. His edition presents a considerable number of trifling changes and corrections of some typographical errors. He omits, through negligence, five lines, 2047 (ed. MacColl, p. 205, l. 1057) and 2923-27, (*ibid.*, p. 235, ll. 723-27). The following passages will show that Vera Tassis has some readings in common with B. He presumably had at his disposal an intermediate text, lost to us, as he does not make consistent use of B, even where it is clearly correct.

- 1. 16, A. que abrasa al Sol el ceno de *la* frente
B. que arruga el Sol el ceno de *su* frente
C. que arruga al Sol el ceno de *su* frente.
- 1. 160, A. ida; BC, huyda.
- 1. 165, A. sacar; BC, arrancar.
- 1. 326, AC. rueda; B, rienda.
- 1. 548, A. aplaçarnos; BC, aplaçamos.
- 1. 700, A. En este misero, en este
mortal Planeta; ò signo,
B. En aqueste pues del Sol
ya frenesi, ya delito [!]
C. En aqueste pues del Sol
ya frenesi, ò ya delirio.
- 1. 1605, A. de la docta Academia de sus ruinas
B. en . . . las minas
C. de . . . sus minas.

Some of these readings of BC are to be referred to A's; just what value to give to B, when not supported by C, it is difficult to decide. B abounds in errors of all kinds. The new material which it contains is sometimes no better nor worse than the rest of the *comedia*. Until more is known of the ways and means of literary pirates of the time, the variants must be treated with respect. Personally, I incline to the suspicion that B represents, with many obvious errors, Calderon's original *borrador* as first acted on the stage, and that A reproduces the more finished product, carelessly printed, as given to Joseph for publication. I am aware of objections that may be urged against such a view.

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

University of Toronto.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

I.

The familiar triplet in the *Lay of the Last Minstrel*, III, 15-17 :

"Love rules the court, the camp, the grove,
And men below, and saints above,
For love is heaven, and heaven is love."

is perhaps drawn from the refrain of Schiller's *Der Triumph der Liebe* :

"Selig durch die Liebe
Götter—durch die Liebe
Menschen Göttern gleich !
Liebe macht den Himmel
Himmlischer—die Erde
Zu dem Himmelreich."

II.

Writing of Shelley, Browning (*Memorabilia*, 13-15) uses a notable figure :

"For there I picked upon the heather
And there I put inside my breast
A moulting feather, an eagle feather!"

which he apparently borrowed from Young (*The Complaint, Night II*, 601-606) :

"His flight Philander took, his upward flight,
If ever soul ascended. Had he dropped,
(That eagle genius !) O had he let fall
One feather as he flew, I then had wrote
What friends might flatter, prudent foes forbear,
Rivals scarce damn, and Zoilus reprieve."

This passage suggests a more definite explanation of Browning's lines than any yet offered, as follows :

The later poet writes in conscious imitation of the earlier. Young states an hypothetical case, ". . . O had he let fall One feather . . ."; and his apodosis is given as contrary to fact, ". . . I then had wrote . . .". Browning makes his statement as fact, ". . . I picked up . . . an eagle feather!" To follow Young, he must now say, ". . . I wrote . . .". Not willing to hazard so bold an assertion, he breaks off with the line, for which, I believe, no explanation has yet been offered :

Well, I forget the rest.

III.

Milton's sounding word-group (*Paradise Lost*, v, 600-601, and elsewhere) :

". Angels, Progeny of Light,
Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers,"

harks back, as might be expected, to the Bible (*Colossians* I, 16) : ". . . . whether they be thrones or dominations, or principalities, or powers"

Perhaps, however, the use of two words, *Dominations* and *Virtues*, may indicate that Milton's source was Ben Jonson, *Eupheme*, ix : *Elegy on My Muse* :

"He knows what work he hath done, to call this guest
Out of her noble body to this feast :
And give her place according to her blood
Amongst her peers, those princes of all good !
Saints, Martyrs, Prophets, with those Hierarchies,
Angels, Archangels, Principalities,
The Dominations, Virtues, and the Powers,
The Thrones, the Cherubs, and Seraphic bowers,
That, planted round, there sing before the Lamb
A new song to his praise"

Prior liked the group, imitating it in *Solomon on the Vanity of the World*, I, 641-644 :

". . . . essences unseen, celestial names,
Enlightening spirits, and ministerial flames,
Angels, dominions, potentates, and thrones,
All that in each degree the name of creature owns :"

And Mrs. Browning, *A Drama of Exile*, Scene 2 :

"The angelic hosts, the archangelic pomps,
Thrones, dominations, princedoms,"

IV.

The closing scene of *Ivanhoe* seems to be taken from Shenstone's *Love and Honour*. That Scott was familiar with Shenstone's work seems sufficiently indicated by casual references like that in the last chapter of *Quentin Durward*, and more especially that in the prose introduction to *Rokeby*.

In Scott's story, Rebecca loves Ivanhoe, to whom she is, besides, deeply grateful for benefits received, but who loves Rowena, a maiden of his own nation. Rowena herself is a colorless figure, taking no active part in the story. Just after Rowena and Ivanhoe are married, Rebecca calls upon Rowena, and states that she is going with

her father to Grenada, where she will devote her life to the service of her people. It is hinted that she would enter a convent if her race possessed such an institution. She presents to Rowena a casket of costly jewels.

In Shenstone's poem, Elvira is an Iberian maiden, captured by the British, and

" assign'd to Henry's care,
Lord of her life, her fortune, and her fame."

Henry treats Elvira with the greatest kindness, makes her his friend and companion, and she loves him. When the time of her release comes, and she is about to go back to Spain, she tells Henry of her love, and asks his in return; but learns that his faith is plighted to Maria, an English maiden, who comes into the story only at this point and only by name. Elvira then gives Henry a casket of jewels for Maria, saying that, when she reaches Spain, she will enter

" the sacred cells
Of some lone cloister"

J. W. PEARCE.

New Orleans, La.

THREE NOTES TO A. DAUDET'S STORIES.

In *Les Vieux*, Daudet wrote: "J'avais déjà choisi mon cagnard entre deux roches. . ." It seems that "cagnard" must be labelled "colloquial" rather than "provincial." This appears from an entry by Sainéan in a recent article on the Romance derivatives of Latin *CANIS*¹: "anc. fr. *cagnard*, *cagnart*, lieu abrité ou exposé au soleil (que les chiens recherchent dès qu'ils ressentent un changement de temps) où se retirent les gueux. Encore aujourd'hui le cagnard du Jardin des Tuilleries, appelé aussi *la petite Provence*, est toujours rempli de gueux."

In *Les Vieux*, a child is reading from the life of St. Irenaeus: "Alors saint Irénée s'écria: Je suis le froment du Seigneur; il faut que je sois moulu par la dent de ces animaux. . ." As I discovered

¹ *Mém. d. l. Soc. d. Linguistique de Paris*, xiv, p. 239.

from meeting the same quotation in J. Schlumberger's poignant study, *Le Mur de Verre* (Paris, 1904), Daudet must have confused St. Irenaeus with St. Ignatius of Antioch, in whose well-known epistle to the Romans (iv, i and ii, ed. Lightfoot, ii, p. 648) occur the words: "Frumentum sum dei, et per dentes bestiarum molar, ut mundus panis inveniar Christi." Or did Daudet prefer *Irénée* to *Ignace* on the ground of euphony?

In 1904, M. Hugues Le Roux asserted in public lectures in Chicago and elsewhere that he, and not Alphonse Daudet, was the real author of the story *La Belle-Nivernaise*. It will be remembered that this tale was originally published in English in the *Youth's Companion* (Boston) in 1885. Wishing if possible to control the statement of M. Le Roux, the undersigned, sometime in the summer of 1905, addressed a courteous letter to M. Léon A. Daudet, son and literary executor of A. Daudet, inquiring as to the truth of the matter. This letter has not been honored with a reply. The inference seems to be that, following the example of the illustrious Dumas, Alphonse Daudet in at least one case put out the work of his secretary as his own, for the editors of the *Youth's Companion* state that in the correspondence Daudet more than once referred to *La Belle-Nivernaise* as "ma nouvelle." It was long ago remarked that the choppy sentences and a certain looseness of language observed in the story are quite unlike Daudet's usual style. This fact lends additional support to the idea that the *La Belle-Nivernaise* was not written—though perhaps retouched—by the author of *Tartarin sur les Alpes*.

T. ATKINSON JENKINS.

University of Chicago.

RESIDUAL ENS.

The scholastic dignities of *ens* must always be respected. On all occasions this wordlet should be qualified by an adjective profoundly technical. Whether ever before it has been called *residual ens* does not matter; it is important only that the epithet be suggestive of philosophy and science.

Surely the meaning of *residual ens* has unfathomable depths, reaching into the last mysteries of the universe. Less appalling, but really more alarming, is its connotation in the realm of personal conduct. This is duly set forth by the Bishop of Dunkeld, with a negligible feature of ecclesiasticism :

Quhen halie Kirk first florist in gouthheid,
Prelatis wer chosin of all perfection ;
For *Conscience* than the brydill had to leid.
And fra *Conscience* the *Con* they clip away,
And maid of *Conscience* *Science* and na mair ;
And fra *Sci* of *Science* wes adew,
Than left thai nocht bot this ssillab *Ens*.
Quhilk in our language signifies that schrew
Riches and geir, that gart all grace go hens.
Gavin Douglas, *Conscience* (Small, i, 121).

The Scottish editor-in-chief of the *Oxford Dictionary* will not undervalue this citation, which so notably antedates Sir Philip Sidney's "quiddity of *Ens*" (*An Apologie for Poetry*, ed. Schuckburgh, p. 42 f.). Dr. Fennell (*Stanford Dictionary*) had also not gone back beyond Sidney to give ear to the lamentation of the good Bishop.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

MR. WILLIAM J. CRAIG (1843-1906).

American papers seem not to have noticed the death, on December 12th, 1906, of Mr. William J. Craig, known to many as the editor of the *Oxford Shakespeare*, and as editor-in-chief of the elaborate *Arden Shakespeare*, published in this country by the Bobbs-Merrill Company. Mr. Craig was born in 1843, in the North of Ireland, and graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he made the acquaintance of Professor William Graham, of Queen's College, Belfast, and of Professor Edward Dowden, who were perhaps his closest friends. After 1874, Mr. Craig lived for the most part in London, although he was for a time Professor of the English Language and Literature at University College, Aberystwith. His published work included the *Oxford Shakespeare*, already mentioned ; a particularly attractive little pocket edition of *Shakespeare*, in forty volumes,

published by Methuen ; and the *King Lear* in the Arden edition. At the time of his death, he was working upon a *Coriolanus*, for the same series.

Mr. Craig's great work, however, was a colossal *Shakespearean Glossary*, to which he had given the most of his time for the last twelve years, and for which he had accumulated an immense mass of material. It is to be hoped that his collections may yet be made available to others ; but even if they are not published, they have not been without value, for there are few English scholars who have written in the past ten years about Shakespeare or his times, who have not recorded their indebtedness to Mr. Craig's great learning and generous help.

In addition to Professors Graham and Dowden, Mr. Craig numbered among his particular friends Mr. Sidney Lee, Mr. A. H. Bullen, Mr. Thomas Seccombe, Professor W. P. Ker, and Dr. John Rae. The few Americans who had the privilege of his acquaintance will testify to his kindness and his unusual personal charm. As a friend wrote of him in the *London Times*, "He was that rare kind of skilled philologist with whom style, thought, and feeling were the only things that counted in literature. A veritable passion for tracing the meaning of words and for illustrating their usage never dimmed his critical perception. As a man Mr. Craig had a genius for friendship. An active sympathy with the aspirations and enthusiasms of youth kept him young at heart to the end. Never happier than when rendering service to others, he placed his stores of learning with self-denying liberality at the disposal of all others. Tolerant of others' foibles, he was when in good health the most buoyant and genial of companions. A keen sense of humour made him alive to the comical character of situations which his tendency to absent-mindedness and his singularly difficult handwriting occasionally provoked. His closest friends were men sharing his own tastes. But he was at home with everybody. The Savage Club had no more popular member. The soul of magnanimity and modesty himself, he only reprobed in others meanness or self-conceit."

EDWARD PAYSON MORTON.

Indiana University.

Die altenglischen Säugetiernamen. Zusammengestellt und erläutert von RICHARD JORDAN. (*Anglistische Forschungen* XII.) Heidelberg, 1903. Pp. xii + 212.

The appearance of Jordan's monograph on the Old English mammal-names calls to mind the fact that in recent years considerable attention has been paid to the vocabulary of the early Germanic languages. The first of the special treatises in this particular field was Hoops' *Über die altenglischen Pflanzennamen*, Freiburg 1889; this was followed by Whitman's *The Birds of Old English Literature* (*Journal of Germanic Philology* 2. 194 ff., 1898); Palander's *Die althochdeutschen Tiernamen*, Darmstadt, 1899; and Björkman's *Die Pflanzennamen der althochdeutschen Glossen* (*Zs. f. deutsche Wortforschung* 2. 202 ff., 1902).¹

Jordan acknowledges his chief indebtedness to the treatise of Palander. The work is based upon a fairly complete list of examples, chiefly of the author's own collecting, in which no attempt has been made to normalize the spelling or insert the proper marks of quantity. In the sections treating of grammar and etymology, however, the spelling is normalized, and the macron is used to mark length of vowel. In the citing of examples the author has rarely gone beyond the eleventh century, unless the form of a word of later date places it beyond question in the Old English period.

In the introduction a general view is taken of the whole field. An attempt is made to place together the names that are approximately of the same age and belong to the same speech-period. The chronological assignment of a name is at the best a difficult task; frequently it depends solely upon a questionable etymological relation. There is need, then, of extreme caution in the drawing of inferences, for the investigator is aware that many errors have originated in the omissions and deficiencies of tradition. Jordan is not one of

¹ Since this review was written three monographs have appeared:—*Die altenglischen namen der Insekten Spinnen- und Krustentiere*, von John van Zandt Cortelyou. Heidelberg, 1906.—*Eigentümlichkeiten des englischen Wortschatzes*, von Richard Jordan. Heidelberg, 1906.—*The Anglo-Saxon Weapon Names treated archaeologically and etymologically*, by May Lansfield Keller. Heidelberg, 1906.

those who always have a root at hand to cover every case; he is cautious and conservative and invariably prefers to state a negative conclusion rather than force an interpretation which the facts will not warrant. His chief conclusions may be summed up as follows:

The mammal-names form an important part of the vocabulary of early Indo-Germanic. Among them are the following names, the plurals of which signify domestic animals: *hund*, *eoh*, *cū*, *stēor*, *cealf*, *sugu*, *bucca*, *hæfer*, *hēcen*, *ēowu*, *weðer*, *oxa*. The remainder are the names of beasts of prey, *wulf*, *otor*; the names of the rodents, *mūs*, *befor*; and that of the stag, *eoh*.

To the list of words inherited from the Indo-Germanic belong those which are lacking in the Asiatic languages, but which, outside of the Germanic, appear in one or more European languages. Such are the early European *fola*, *fearh*, *lox*, *hearma*, *il*, *heorot*, *eofor*, *hwæl*, *hara*, and the North European *wesend*, common only to Celtic, Germanic, and Baltic.

Then follow those names which are not present outside of the Germanic but are classed as Early Germanic because they are possessed in common by the Old Germanic dialects. In this group the names of wild animals predominate: *fox*, *bera*, *mearð*, *wesle*, *āeweorna*, *seolh*, *rā*, *ūr*. *Hors*, *hengest*, *swīn*, *gilte* signify domestic animals; *ticcen* may be placed here, and possibly *rēt*.

To the narrower province of West Germanic belong only the names of modern domestic animals: *ryðba*, *ram*, *hryðer*, *bar*, *scēp*. The OE. has only *bicce*, *ræcc*, *colt* in common with the Norse; only *fōr* in common with the Low German.

The special OE. names are not so numerous as the creations of the Old High German. This is due in part to the fact that the OHG. is more inclined to form new names by composition with appellatives, or with animal names already existing, than is the OE.

Among the borrowed words those derived from the Latin play the most important part. To the oldest class belong *esol*, *mūl*, *sēamere*, *elpend*. These borrowings came through trade; *elpend*, for example, presupposes traffic in ivory. Later in British-Christian times, when a knowledge of lion-names implied an acquaintance with Biblical and ecclesiastical literature, *lēo* was adopted. But

while *lēo* was thoroughly assimilated, names like *tiger* and *pandher* were only literary foreign words, and were never fully anglicized. *Camel* is met with only in late Northumbrian. In the tenth century, *ylp* was derived from *elpend*. In addition to the words borrowed from the Latin there may be cited that remarkable Germanic-Slavic camel-name which appears in OE. as *olfend*. It is related to the Greek *Ἄλεφας*.

The British-Celtic words are *brocc* and *assa*. The latter form, which is met with commonly in Biblical literature, is doubtless to be traced back to the influence of Irish Christianity.

Our animal names were little influenced by the influx of the Old Norse, which made itself felt most strongly toward the end of the OE. period. Only two words rightly belong here—*hran*, and the composite *horshwæl*, names of two northern animals which Alfred came to know through his intercourse with the Norwegian Ohthere.

On phonetic grounds it can be assumed that the Old French *dain*, analogous to the Lat. *dāmus*, is the source of the OE. *dā*. The continental Germanic influence is so slight at this period that it hardly comes into consideration. Possibly the form *stānbucea* may be placed in connection with the OHG. *steinbock*. Finally, there should be mentioned as a translation of the Lat. *unicornis* the form *āhyrne*. Corresponding to the poetical kenning is the circumlocution *nihtgēnē* for *hyāna* in the glosses.

A trait common to the OE., and in general to the Old Germanic animal-names, is the regular way in which the female is distinguished from the male, the young from the mature.

Palander thus designates two important classes of sex-distinctions: 'In order to separate distinctly the female animal from the corresponding male, either the feminine designations are created out of separate roots or are built up by "motion" from the existing masculine forms and common nouns.' The first in general finds application only with domestic animals, among which the distinctions of sex are of the most practical significance to man. In OE., as a general thing, are found the same pairs as in OHG., in which feminine and masculine animal-names of different stems stand over against each other; examples are: *bicce*—*tifehund*, *myre*—*stēda*, *gat*—*hæfer*, etc. The single case in which this suppletive

change is found among wild animals is that of *hind*—*heorot*. This change of stem seems to be based on the distinction between the horned male and the unhorned female.

The second method of forming the feminine animal-names is 'motion,' which in OE. occurs in suffixal change as well as in composition. The suffixes which are here to be considered are *-ōn*, *-iō*, *-iōn*, *-injō*. Of these only the last, *-injō*, is productive in the OE. period. In Mod. E. the suffix *-injō* appears only in *vixen*, while the suffix *-in* is still productive in Mod. G.

Next to the suffixal change, composition plays the most important part, and in the course of speech-evolution ever gains in significance. Examples are: *ass-myre*, *cū-cealf*, *rāh-dēor*. On the same principle rest the Mod. E. *bitch-fox*, *dog-fox*, etc.

Corresponding to the usual method of prefixing masculine or feminine pronouns in Mod. E. is the reference in *Ælfric's Glossary* (WW. 320. 18, 19): *ursus* : *bera*, but *ursa* : *hēo*. Finally, there should be noted the rare case in which the difference in gender is expressed merely by the help of the article (cf. Greek *ἡ ἵππος*). This finds application with the borrowed word *lēo*. The method of designating the young is closely related to that used to distinguish the female; furthermore, only the different stems of the young of domestic animals are analogous; cf. the pairs *hwelp-hund*, *fola-hors*, etc.

In marked contrast to the OHG., the number of OE. diminutives formed by suffixes or composition is very small. With the suffix *-ina* are formed *swīn*, *ticcen*, *hēcen*. The only diminutives formed by composition are *leon-hwelp* and *hind-cealf*.

The suppletive change of masculine and feminine animal-names shows the only certain disagreement of meaning between Indo-Germanic and Germanic. Sometimes a word which is known outside of Germanic as masculine appears in Germanic as feminine. For example: Lat. *haedus*, 'he-goat' = OE. *gāt*, 'she-goat.' It seems probable that when two or more stems for the designating of a domestic animal were existent, one was used to distinguish the female from the male, the young from the mature, the one name taking from the other a part of its range of meaning. Thus *lamb* signifies in Gothic the common 'sheep,' but in

West Germanic, in competition with **skapa*, it is particularized into 'lamb.' On similar grounds might be explained the change of meaning from the OE. *hund*, 'dog,' to the Mod. E. 'hound,' 'sporting dog.' In ME. *dogge* occurs conjointly with *hund*; at that period a new differentiation enters, whereby *hund* loses its former meaning, and obtains the new sense of 'sporting dog,' while *dogge* (LOE. *dogga*) retains its general signification.

The problem of the original signification of animal-names presents far greater difficulties than the question of secondary changes of meaning; it resolves itself chiefly into a study of the root, and of the simple idea underlying it. In many cases the primitive sense can be inferred from the related speech-material. The safest interpretations are ordinarily based on external appearances. *Bera*, *befor* are designated 'the brown'; *hara*, 'the gray'; the quills give the name *il* to the porcupine; and the otter is called *otor*, 'water-animal,' on account of its place of retreat. Abstract significations are *hors*, the 'swift'; *ram*, the 'strong.'

The main body of the monograph is devoted to the discussion of 115 classified mammal-names. These are divided into 10 orders as follows: Pitheci, Apes; Chiroptera, Bats; Carnivora, Beasts of prey; Pinnipedia, Fin-footed animals; Insectivora, Moles; Rodentia, Rodents; Proscocidae, Proboscidians; Perrissodactyla, Hoofed animals; Artiodactyla, Cloven-hoofed animals; Cetacea, Marine animals.

In his treatment of the individual animal-names the author first cites the various spellings of a word, then gives lists of examples, of compounds and derivatives, and finally discusses the meaning and etymology. Under derivatives are given not only the feminine nouns formed on the same stem, but adjectives and other parts of speech as well. Under the head of 'compounds' occur all names into which the word under discussion enters. One might question the wisdom of devoting space to such words as *hors-minte*, *hors-ðistel*, etc., which bear only a remote relation to the animal, and more properly belong to the province of plant-names. Compounds like *cræt-hors* and *ræd-hors* are of course of a quite different category, and find here their natural place.

General names, such as *nyten*, *dēor*, *feoh*, *orf*,

etc., have not been considered. Of this group, *dēor* at least deserves to be included, because it sometimes possesses the individual sense of 'deer'; cf. Oros. 1. 1: *Ohthere hafde ða he ðone cyninge sohte tamra deor unbekohtra syx hund. Ða deor hi hatað hranas.*

In the preface the author expresses the hope that he has not been too lavish in the citation of examples. Far from criticizing on that score, the student might wish that an attempt had been made to present a complete list. This feature would make the monograph more valuable as a work of reference. The examples are arranged according to cases after the manner of Grein's *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter*, and as far as examined are accurately recorded.

The present writer has had occasion recently to go over the same ground as that covered by Jordan's monograph, and has noted the following additional words which seem to deserve a place in the list of OE. mammal-names.

The abbreviations used in the references are those adopted by Bosworth-Toller.

I. *Hattefagol*, 'hedgehog.' *Ps. Spl. M.* 103. 19: *herinaciis, hattefagol.*

II. *Nicor*, m., 'hippopotamus.' It is true that ordinarily *nicor* is a general term for water-monster, but in the following references it is equivalent to the Lat. gloss 'hypopotamus.' *Nar.* 20. 29: *Him wæron ða breost gelice necres breostum: hypopotami pectore.* *Nar.* 11. 11: *Nicoras: hypopotami.*

III. *Mæstelberg*, m., 'fattened hog.' *Mt. Skt.* 7. 6, note: *ante porcos, before bergum; ðæt sindon ða mæstelbergas; ðæt aron ða gehadade menn, and ða gode menn, and ða wlonce menn for hogas Godes bebed und godspelles.*

IV. *Hyroxa* m., 'hired ox.' *L. In.* (Th.) 61. 1, note: *hyrozan.*

V. *Gestēdhors*, n., 'stud-horse, stallion.' *Bd.* 2. 14; *S.* 517. 5: *He ðone cyng bæd ðæt he him wæpen sealde and gestedhors: rogavit sibi regem arma dare et equum emissarum.*

VI. *Biren*, f., 'she-bear.' This is given as a hypothetical form by Jordan, who apparently overlooked the reference Ct., (OET.) 30, 12: *birenefeld.* It is recognized by both Sweet and Hall.

VII. *Hēadēor*, m., 'stag' or 'deer.' *Chr.* 1086; *Erl.* 222. 29; *Erl. & Pl.* 221. 10: *Hexam.*

9 ; Norm. 16. 3 : *Swa swidðe he lufode ða headeor swilee he wäre heora fæder.*

VII. *Purlamb*, n., 'wether-lamb.' Ex. 12.5 : *Dat lamb sceal bion anwintre purlamb clæne and unwemme* : erit agnus absque mascula, masculus, anniculus.¹

An excellent bibliography of OE. texts and auxiliary helps adds greatly to the value of the work. A German, and possibly a Latin, index would be helpful for reference.

The monograph is in no sense a popular work. The subject is treated chiefly from the philological standpoint, and consequently its strongest appeal is to the student of language. Yet incidentally it makes a few contributions to zoology, and throws side-lights on the life and customs of the OE. period.

Investigators who treat a subject thus exhaustively bring to light the errors of early lexicographers, help to free the language of its burden of spurious forms and meanings, and greatly lessen the labors of those who follow after. Jordan's monograph is in the main a careful and scholarly piece of work, and constitutes a real addition to our knowledge of the OE. vocabulary.

CHARLES HUNTINGTON WHITMAN.

Rutgers College.

MAX PLESSOW : *Geschichte der Fabeldichtung in England bis zu John Gay (1726).* Nebst Neu- druck von Bullokars "Fables of Æsop," 1585, "Booke at Large" 1580, "Bref Grammar for English" 1586, und "Pamphlet for Grammar" 1586. Berlin : Mayer und Müller, 1906. 8vo., clii and 392 pp. (*Palæstra : Untersuchungen und Texte aus der deutschen und englischen Philologie*, LII.)

As the title implies, the present monograph is a study of fable literature in England from the earliest period to John Gay. The author, in

¹The OE. form of the word 'hog' has only recently been discovered. Professor Skeat writes Dr. H. L. Har- grove in November, 1902 : 'The A. S. gen. plur. *hogga*, "of hoggs," occurs twice in a scrap picked out of an old binding only last week. It is perfectly genuine, and before 1066.'—Professor A. S. COOK.

making a list of fable collections prior to Gay, found that a certain collection of Æsop's fables, that of William Bullokar, could not be obtained on the Continent. A trip to England was the result, and the determination on the part of the author to give the world a new edition of this work.

The monograph, therefore, is divided into two parts. The first part is devoted to a study of fable literature in England down to John Gay. In the second part is the text of Bullokar's "Fables of Æsop," his "Booke at Large," his "Bref Grammar for English" and his "Pamphlet for Grammar."

In the first part the subject-matter is divided according to periods, the principal of which are : (1) Fable Literature of the Normans and Anglo-Saxons ; and (2) Latin Fable Literature in England during the Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. Several pages are devoted also to the fable literature of Scotland. By the word fable we are to understand exclusively animal tales with a moral application.

The remarkable growth and popularity of fable literature in England, especially in the Latin language, during the thirteenth and the early part of the fourteenth century is emphasized by Dr. Plessow.

The fables of Marie de France and Odo of Cherington were especially well known, and must have been freely copied and imitated. Marie would naturally be very popular among her fellow-countrymen, and they were not few, in England. This seems also to have been true for the Anglo-Norman Nicole Bozon (c. 1300), who inserted fables in his sermons. Bozon was dependent for the greater part of his fables, not on Odo (as Dr. Plessow asserts), but on Marie, or at least, the Alfred-Marie tradition as opposed to the Romulus-Odo tradition.¹

Attention is called to the fact that in Bozon's fables several English words and even whole sentences are employed. This leads to the mooted question of a lost English Romulus. Dr. Plessow, however, throws no new light upon this subject.

¹Cf. *A Comparative Study of the Æsopic Fable in Nicole Bozon* (Johns Hopkins Dissertation), Philip W. Harry, 1903. (*University Studies*, University of Cincinnati, Series II, Vol. 1, No. 2, March-April, 1905.)

A short chapter is devoted to the Scottish fabulists, and a study of Henryson's fables convinces the author of the present work that Henryson's dependence on Lydgate (who it should be remembered principally follows Marie) appears to be greater than generally supposed. Caxton's influence upon Henryson is also to be noted.

Caxton's two books, *Reynard the Foxe* (1481) and *Fables of AEsop* (1484) show their imprint on later writers of every *genre*. AEsop was the popular author of the day : his fables were translated for the school-children ; they were made use of in political debates and quarrels ; they even invaded the stage. Dr. Plessow has pointed out the great popularity of the fable with all classes of writers during the times, especially, of Chaucer and Shakespeare. He has gone through an immense amount of material and collected the "stray" fables found interwoven with subjects of a different character.

Bullokar's "Aesop's Fables" appeared in 1585. They were translated by him from the Latin, but he tells us that he mislaid his Latin copy after he had finished his work and was consequently unable to say what edition he had used, though he thought as near as he could "ges of" that it was the edition of Thomas Marsh, London, 1580. By reason of some variations in Bullokar's translation, Dr. Plessow holds the opinion, however, that his original was rather the edition of Wynkyn de Worde (1535) and that the edition of Thomas Marsh is from the same source. Wynkyn de Worde's "Aesop" is in turn dependent on the Venice edition of 1534.

Bullokar has in his collection 131 "proper" fables of AEsop, 8 gathered out of divers authors, 95 from Abstemius, 33 from Valla, 99 from Rimicius, and 11 from Poggius. Bullokar's translation did not seem to enjoy any special popularity. His phonetic script (in which the fables were written) was doubtless a hinderance. The edition used by Dr. Plessow is in the British Museum, but there are also other editions of 1621 and 1647.

The fable in England, even more so than in France, frequently becomes satire, and generally political satire, rather than moral. The fables of Gay are of this kind. He attacks the ministers and parliament. The influence of La Fontaine

upon Gay is apparent despite his striving after originality. In true German fashion our author makes a careful study of Gay's style, composition, verse and rhyme.

Bullokar wrote his fables "in true orthography with grammar notes." He wished to show his countrymen how false their orthography was at that time and how they must write well. The fact that he selected fables speaks well for their popularity in all circles.

Bullokar was indeed a phonetist. He was convinced that twenty-four letters were not sufficient to picture "English speech," which, according to him, needs forty letters. At that time, many of his countrymen thought, so he complained, that he wanted "to change English speech altogether."

Accompanying the fables are some "short sentences of the Wys Cato," also translated by Bullokar from the Latin. They are in verse and still in "tru orthography." His "Bref Grammar," which was an abstract of his "Grammar at larg," has the distinction of being perhaps the first English grammar ever written.

The chief interest to us to-day in these works of Bullokar (outside of his Fables) lies in the fact that they show that in the sixteenth century there were quarrels concerning the orthography of English speech, and that educators concerned themselves with providing some "remedie" as they are doing to-day. But, on the other hand, a close study of the phonetic script might reveal the fact that certain words at that period had a different pronunciation from what is generally suspected to-day.

Dr. Plessow has given us a careful outline of fable literature in England down to the first quarter of the eighteenth century. His work abounds in information and suggestion that could only be acquired by wide reading and studious effort. A plentiful supply of welcome information on fable literature in England, but more especially that of the later period, has been unearthed by him.

PHILIP HARRY.

Northwestern University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A LANGUAGE OF THE PHILIPPINES.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—On January 26, 1907, Dr. Charles Wilhelm Seidenadel of Chicago presented to the Philological Society of the University of Chicago selected chapters of his manuscript *First Grammar of The Bontoc Igorot*. The author, who is a trained philologist and a thorough musician, associated last summer for several months with the members of a group of the Igorot tribe, about thirty in number, brought to Chicago at the close of the St. Louis Exposition and exhibited at River View Park. Continuous intercourse with these people, often lasting ten hours each day, enabled Mr. Seidenadel not only to understand their language, but also to converse with them freely in it upon a basis of mutual intelligibility. He was successful in transcribing between three and four thousand complete sentences, which he first repeatedly tested in actual use and then subjected to critical examination and classification for the purpose of the Grammar.

The linguistic and ethnological importance of a study like that here mentioned is clear in the light of our close national relations with the Philippine Islands and of the almost utter lack of trustworthy philological work in the languages of the archipelago. Mr. Seidenadel's remarkable initial success, his singular natural gift and special training for making accurate phonetic transcriptions of the spoken word, and his personal friendly relations with a considerable group of the natives prominent in the Igorot tribe, are, it seems to the members of the Philological Society, strong reasons for expecting from Mr. Seidenadel's further research in this direction results of very great importance for the linguistic and ethnological history of the Islands.

Mr. Seidenadel hopes to secure from some source the means needed for residence in the Philippines to complete his studies of the Bontoc Igorot and to extend his attention to other allied dialects.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING,
Secretary of the Philological Society.

The University of Chicago.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *bore*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The *Oxford Dictionary* rejects the usual explanation of the verb *bore*, 'to weary,' as a figurative use of *bore*, 'to pierce,' holding that

the noun *bore* in the sense of 'the malady of ennui' (1766) is the source of the other senses, and of the verb itself. An interesting passage from a letter of Lady Sarah Lennox, January 9, 1766 (*Life and Letters*, 1902, i, 179), is worth adding to the quotations given by Dr. Murray, and may perhaps be thought to supply evidence for the priority of the noun:

"I have given you a pretty good boar upon dress . . . I told you the word 'boar' is a fashionable expression for tiresome people & conversations, & is a very good one & *very* useful, for one may tell anybody (Ld G. Cavendish for example), 'I am sure this will be a boar, so I must leave you, Ld George.' If it was not the fashion it would be very rude, but I own I encourage the fashion vastly, for it's delightful I think; one need only name a pig or pork, & nobody dares take it ill but hold their tongues directly."

Yet after all it seems more probable that the current etymology is correct. The verb in the sense of 'to weary by tedious conversation' is quoted from 1768, and may well have been in use a few years earlier. *To bore one's ears* in the sense of 'to force one to listen' is duly registered by Dr. Murray, with three quotations, the latest from 1642, and he adds a cross-reference to the verb *bore* 'to weary.' The following additional quotations (especially the second) conduct one easily enough to the latter verb, for it is not difficult to pass from 'to bore a person's ears with offensive or tedious conversation' to the simpler 'to bore a person.' Such ellipses are common enough.

1665. *The English Rogue* (i, 242 of the reprint): "His prohane and irreligious discourse did so bore my glowing ears, that . . . I could not endure to hear him blasphemē."

1699. *The Country Gentleman's Vade Mecum*, p. 4: "If you'll come here you must sometimes expect to be encountered with the Apes and Peacocks of the Town, those useless Creatures that we dignifie and distinguish by the modish Titles of *Fops* and *Beaux*, and what's worse, be compelled to suffer your Ears to be bor'd through and grated with an empty, tedious Din of their dull Impertinencies, or else the squeamish Cox[c]ombs look awry and scornfully upon you, and immediately repute you to be a *proud, ill-natur'd, unmannerly Country Fellow*."

There is surely no difficulty in getting from the verb *bore* in the figurative sense of 'to weary' to the noun *bore* 'ennui.' As for the adjective *French* in *French bore* (1768),—which Dr. Murray says "naturally suggests that the word is of French origin" and which leads him to hazard the conjecture *bourre*, 'padding,' 'triviality,'—

there is surely no difficulty about it. Instead of indicating a French origin for the *word*, it doubtless indicates a French origin for the *state of mind*. Indeed Dr. Murray himself remarks that the "malady of ennui" was "supposed to be specially 'French.' "

G. L. KITTREDGE.

Harvard University.

Beowulf, 62.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—Having been forced to protest against the charge of "questionable tactics" preferred against me in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxii, 96, I ask your indulgence for handing to you the following brief and final reply in this matter.

1. It is entirely unfair to say that I have "persisted in seeing things in the autotype that surely are not there." I never dreamed of claiming or insinuating that I could see a trace of a *þ* or *a* or *w* or *a*. I am neither prepared to say what the erased letters were nor what they were not—excepting the *s* which I am quite willing to believe Professor Bryant has successfully rescued. If Professor Bryant has information about the other letters, it is to be regretted that he has not divulged it. I merely cited, by way of concrete illustration, what seems to me a possible case, stating at the same time distinctly that "the nature of the word or words erased as well as the reading of the scribe's original ms. is entirely a matter of speculation." If I am hopelessly unable to grasp Professor Bryant's position, he fails in no less degree to understand my point of view.

2. The reading "hyrde ic in *Fat. Ap.* 70," in my letter, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxi, 256^b, l. 1 f. is a regrettable, but not unnatural slip of the pen (possibly a typographical error), which is in a measure counterbalanced by the occurrence, in l. 10, of the correct form: "hyrde we 70." Professor Bryant does not mention the latter quotation, but makes much of the "misquotation." I had not noticed the slip until it was brought home to me in a manner not altogether pleasant. A hand-written duplicate (which I have saved) of the copy sent to the Editors shows the proper plural form *we*.

3. The charge that "the first time [I] referred to the passage [I] gave the wrong line-number" is an interesting puzzle to me. To the very best of my recollection, I never referred to the *Fat. Ap.* passage except in that much abused letter (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxi, 256^b). The only explanation I can guess of this terrible charge is that Professor Bryant had in mind somebody else, namely Dr. Schücking, who, on p. 85 of his *Satzverknüpfung*, misprints: "Hyrde we, þat Jacob . . . V. 20" (instead of 70). But I most certainly beg to be excused from acting the part of a scapegoat.

FR. KLAEBER.

The University of Minnesota.

ERRATA.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—Permit me to say that in my article printed in last December's issue of this journal there are some errata which I wish to correct. They are as follows:

- P. 236a, line 21. *yrub* instead of *yrnb*.
- line 28. *winierdas* instead of *winierdes*.
- P. 236b, line 26. *sapinus* instead of *supinus*.
- P. 237a, line 33. *Ledern* instead of *Leder*.
- line 37 and 44. *Kunne* instead of *kunne*.
- line 48. *Not* instead of *Note*.
- P. 237b, line 40. *HH* instead of *Hpt.*

I take this opportunity to draw attention to the fact that in his *Contributions to Old English Lexicography*, London, 1906, pp. 6-7, Napier, at Prof. Toller's suggestion, prints as proof for *arsgang* (*latrina*) the same passages from the *Leechdoms* I had quoted to contradict him. He reinforces them by one from his forthcoming edition of *St. Chrodegang's Rule*, p. 113, where we read *þat meox his arganeges*. He now admits the word with the seemingly well-authenticated by-form *argang* as genuine. As to the latter, I beg to refer to my remarks in the forthcoming number of *Anglia*. Concerning *heorþa* (*nebris*) quoted by me, on page 237a, it should be noted that Sweet fails to record it, though Hall and B.-T. have it, as Napier *l. c.* p. 37 points out, quoting from *St. Chrodegang's Rule*, p. 74, *biccene* = *bycene heorðan* (*pelles buccinas* = *hircinas*). The word has been identified with OHG. *herdo* (*vellus*) by Zupitza, *Die Germ. Gutturale*, p. 111. With regard to *thuachl*, erroneously attributed to Epinal by Sievers, *Ags. Gr.*³, § 222, note 4, observe that the error reappears in Bülbring's *Elementarbuch*, § 133, note and § 528, note 1. With regard to Sievers' statement in § 249, note 2, to the effect that an ancient dat. pl. of *smeoru* is recorded which lacks *-w*, *smerum*, I would ask: Is this not the *smerum* of Lr. 35 (*buccis*) which Sweet, *OET*, p. 529^a, erroneously connects with *smeoru*? Napier, note to *OEGI*, 1, 697, points out the mistake. Finally, I wish to draw attention to two or three words from the oldest Glossaries which, as far as I see, are recorded by neither Hall and Sweet nor Bosworth-Toller: (1) *āsēodan* (*expendere*); on record in the *Corpus Glossary*, ed. Hessels E 542 = Sweet Cp 815, from *Oros. I*, 10¹³; (2) *āemonnis* (*excidium*) *ibid.* E 526, absent from Sweet; (3) *bebitan* (*mordicus conrodere*); on record in *EjEj.* 1319 = Cp 616. The reference is to *Oros. V*, 12². *Asēodan* is, of course, a derivative of *sēod* (*marsupium*).

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.